

No. 240 FEBRUARY 1989

Spearhead

50p

HAS ZIONIST POWER PEAKED?

We analyse the significance
of recent Government
talks with the PLO
(Page 3)



Nationalist comment

WHAT WE THINK

on the month's news

Multi-racialists plumb new depths

Trained observers of brainwashing on television are able to spot many little tricks of public indoctrination that are invisible to the average viewer. Even here, however, not all is known that might be known; we are not privy to all of the sly intrigues of the TV producers because we do not belong to their inner sanctum. Therefore there must be many propaganda stunts put across by these sewer rats on the viewing public which escape even our ever vigilant eyes.

Just occasionally, however, we are favoured with 'inside' information which reveals much more than it was ever the intention of the indoctrinators to reveal. Just such a piece of information reached us two months ago.

Many readers will be familiar with Sir Harry Secombe's *Highway* programme, broadcast on ITV early on Sunday evenings. In this programme a different part of the country is visited each week, and Sir Harry interviews selected local people about their lives and work, shows interesting local scenes, sings the occasional hymn and induces some local singers or poets to perform for the viewers, usually on some religious theme.

Later this year, *Highway* is scheduled to

be broadcast from Bedford. It is customary for the programme to be planned and recorded some months in advance of its showing, and this was done during the last few weeks.

One Bedford institution of some distinction is the choir of the St. Thomas More school. This choir has in recent years won high placings at the musical eisteddfod at Porthcawl, and it was not surprising that Sir Harry was anxious to have it perform on his programme.

The school was approached with a view to this being arranged. One of the first questions put by the *Highway* team was: "How many coloured pupils are in the choir?"

The team were told that there were in fact none, and that in the whole school there was only one coloured pupil.

"That's no good," the school was told. "We want to film a choir that is multi-racial." The school was thereupon asked if it would be permissible to bring in some coloured youngsters from outside, provided by the *Highway* programme, and insert them into the ranks of the choir for the purpose of filming. In other words, the sound recording of the choir — made separately, as is the custom on the programme — would be a recording of the authentic, all-white, choir; but for the purposes of the visual recording the choir would contain several young coloureds. So, what appeared to the viewers as a 'multi-racial' choir would take the credit for the fine singing produced by what was in reality an all-white choir! Not surprisingly, the school assented to this squalid swindle.

Later this year — perhaps quite soon, for all we know — Britain's TV viewers will see the performance on *Highway* programme on Sunday evening. What they will see will be a school choir containing several coloured members — supposedly a fine advert for the new multi-racial order in Britain.

But what they will hear will be the excellent singing of the real choir, the choir in which all members are white! None of them of course, apart from those who read this report or hear of the matter through other means that we will employ in the coming weeks, will know that the whole thing is a gigantic spoof — put across by the multi-racialist fanatics who run the *Highway*

programme, as they run all other programmes shown on television, whatever the channel.

Sir Harry Secombe, as the leading personality in the programme, obviously was a party to this despicable and dishonest stunt, and very possibly may have been the one to initiate it. Sir Harry is a popular figure in the entertainment world nationwide — indeed he is something of a national institution. Every Sunday for several years we have seen him appearing on *Highway* demonstrating to the British public what a thoroughly decent and Christian man he is, showing concern for the welfare of old people, comforting the blind and the crippled, advertising and sponsoring good works and singing the praises of the Lord.

But behind the scenes this paragon of righteousness is quite evidently willing to stoop to the lowest level of mass public deception in order to further the cause of multi-racialism to which he and those like him are dedicated.

As indicated earlier, there is no doubt that these deceptions are being put across on the public all the time. Our mind-controllers assume that the British people will never discover their chicanery. Just once in a while a leak occurs and they get caught out. This is just one such occasion. Here the mask is torn from the face of liberalism and multi-racialism. Behind the holier-than-thou visage presented to the world, what do we see? Trickery, dishonesty, fake-photography and pure lies! We see a cesspool of dirty intrigue, presided over by creatures afraid to have their activities illuminated by the light of day. We see an insidious poison that is eating at the vitals of our country and Western Civilisation. It is a repulsive spectacle to all clean-minded men and women!

Deeper roots of the crime wave

With the appalling murders accompanying the armed raids on homes in the stockbroker belt of Surrey and Kent, and with policemen shot in the course of armed robberies in London and Coventry — all within a single week — there have been fresh cries for more firm measures to be adopted to clamp down on violent crime, including, not unnaturally, the restoration of the death penalty. And it is noteworthy that most of those uttering these cries have been Conservatives.

One would think, from all this, that the Tories had been in opposition for the past decade. But, as everyone knows, they have been the party of government. And, despite all their rhetoric about 'law and order', the Tories' actual record in that department has been lamentable.

This magazine supports the demands for tougher action against violent criminals — in fact we think that in many respects they do not go nearly far enough. The death penalty should most certainly be brought back, and much more besides.

But, equally, we believe that these measures only scratch the surface of the problem.

Behind the escalation of every kind of vile and vicious crime, and the ludicrously soft manner in which the culprits are so often dealt with when they are caught and tried, lies a deeper reality.

SPEARHEAD

No. 240 FEBRUARY 1989

PO BOX 446, London SE23 2LS

Editor: John Tyndall

Spearhead exists to reflect a cross-section of contemporary British Nationalist opinion. It is privately published by its Editor and is independent of all political parties and groups.

Unless it is specifically stated otherwise, the views expressed in signed articles or letters in *Spearhead* are the sole responsibility of their writers and do not necessarily represent the views of the Editor or the policies of any political organisation that *Spearhead* may support editorially.

The appearance of an advertisement in *Spearhead* does not necessarily indicate that the Editor has any knowledge of, interest in or support for the product, service, organisation or function being advertised.

Spearhead welcomes enquiries from prospective advertisers, to whom rates will be sent on request. Advertising matter, accompanied by pre-payment, must be submitted at least one month prior to the publishing date (normally the first day of each month) of the issue for which the advertisement is intended. The Editor reserves the right to refuse to publish advertisements submitted.

The Editor is pleased to receive from readers manuscripts of articles for possible publication, which should normally not be longer than 1,250 words, unless especially pre-arranged with the Editor, and should be typed in double-spacing. No payment is made for articles published, which become *Spearhead* copyright unless the writers specifically request otherwise at the time they submit their manuscripts. The Editor reserves the right to shorten or otherwise amend articles accepted for publication should he deem this necessary.

Those wishing to reprint *Spearhead* articles should first gain the permission of the Editor and undertake to include with the printed matter the author's name and the name and address of *Spearhead*.

This is that we in Britain are breeding a population in which there are ever-increasing numbers of the very worst type of sub-human criminal scum.

Some people on the left of politics argue that it is no use talking in terms of greater deterrents to crime because, with certain types of criminal, deterrents simply do not work. While generally we are opposed to left-wing attitudes to crime and punishment, we have to say that in this particular argument there is more than a grain of truth. Most certainly, there is in Britain today a large criminal sub-stratum consisting of creatures who would not be deterred from their loathsome acts, whatever the punishment they faced if caught.

True, we have always produced such people — but never in more than a fraction of the numbers in which we are producing them today.

Put very simply, the quality of our population is declining. We are breeding fewer and fewer of the best and more and more of the worst.

Is there a solution to this? Yes, there is. But we will not find it, least of all adopt it, as long as our minds are trapped within the present limits of what is permissible policy.

Truly **radical** measures require to be introduced for the weeding out of the lower elements of our population, including not only the criminal but the degenerate, the half-witted, the feckless and the lazy. And then these must be supplemented by equally radical measures for the extended procreation of the types of people able to make Britain a better, stronger, more prosperous, more disciplined and more law-abiding nation.

And then, when we are breeding people of this kind, we must ensure that they grow up in an environment in which all the prevailing influences are such as to impart to them the desired moral and social attitudes.

This will call for nothing short of a **revolution** in this country: a revolution in our various national institutions, such as education, the church, the mass media, the economy and politics; most of all, a revolution in our basic attitudes as a nation, in our whole way of looking at the priorities and goals of society.

It all amounts to this: **how far** are we prepared to go to clean Britain up? If we are prepared to go only so far as present debate allows, only so far and no further, this much can be promised: we will continue to witness a yearly increase in the most abominable types of crime, in the beating of babies, in the raping of eighty-year-old women, in the sexual molestation, followed by the murder, of small children, accompanied of course by equal increases in breast-beating, heart-searching and pious speeches from parliament — all without the slightest result.

On the other hand, if — and only if — we are prepared to go to the very furthest limits in our quest to regenerate and renew this country, by means of radical measures for genetic and environmental improvement, we **can** bring this hideous crime wave to an end and make Britain once again a decent land to live in.

No, we are not inferior!

Nearly a third of Asians in Britain between the ages of 16 and 24 are in higher education,

compared with one in ten Whites. This piece of information was gloatingly trumpeted in the leader column of the *Daily Mail* on December 21st, no doubt in the hope that white British readers would feel suitably put in their place and white 'racists', in particular, would slink away with tails between their legs. As if to emphasise the point, the *Mail* leader continued by saying:-

"It is clear that the Asians are happily following in the footsteps of earlier Jewish immigrants to this country, who raised themselves by study and hard work from poverty to affluence and have made distinguished contributions to this country's cultural life...How encouraging it is to see these young Asian Britons integrating so successfully."

It is tempting at this point to ask the *Mail* leader writer to supply us with the names of the legions of Jewish Shakespeares, Miltons, Turners, Gainsboroughs, Elgars, Purcells and Wrens. We will skip that matter, however, and deal with the general theme of Asian and Jewish 'superiority' so frequently implied in newspaper articles which grovellingly salaam to these ethnic groups by harping on the academic and business success of some of their members.

Most certainly, some Asians and Jews have done well for themselves in this country. Whether this means that they have 'integrated' is a question rather less simple than the *Daily Mail* would lead us to assume. What must be dealt with, however, is the insinuation clearly made in newspaper articles such as these that their academic and business success is a sign of some special qualities and talents that set them above the majority — of indigenous Britons. That suggestion may be answered quite simply by asking why, in that case, India, Pakistan and Bangla Desh, from whence nearly all of the Asians come, are not prosperous, orderly, thriving countries, in every way part of the developed world and contributing notably to the world's technology, science and invention — instead of backward and filthy slums, racked with starvation and disease, and eternally relying on aid from Britain and other western countries to prop up what little economic existence they have.

Likewise, why is Israel a shabby, down-at-heel land which Jews are leaving as fast as they are arriving there — despite the fact that the country receives subsidies from the United States equivalent to about \$5,000 yearly for every Israeli family — in addition to vast sums paid out by West Germany in compensation for the so-called 'Holocaust'?

British people, by comparison, have not exactly been failures at nation-building. Apart from the United Kingdom itself, they have created thriving civilisations in Australia, New Zealand and what was once Rhodesia. They have made the largest contribution of any ethnic group to the building of Canada and the United States, and the second largest contribution to the building of South Africa. Even the tiny few of them who inhabit the Falkland Islands have made a viable economy and a good standard of life out of a bleak climate, modest resources and extreme geographical isolation from most of the rest of the world.

We feel that these latter countries, when assessed in overall performance — industrial, scientific, technological and cultural — do

not exactly lag behind India, Pakistan, Bangla Desh and Israel. We state these things, not for the purpose of denigrating Indians, Pakistanis, Bangladeshis or Jews, but only of reminding readers that, whatever the *Daily Mail* may think, Anglo-Saxons and their Celtic kinsmen of the English-speaking peoples need feel inferior to no-one.

These facts may also suggest that there could be reasons for the success of certain Asians and Jews in this country which require a deeper explanation than mere industry and talent. Could it be that they have certain powerful forces working in their favour? We had better stop at this point — otherwise we might be prosecuted and our magazine closed down for a considerable time!

Mr. Waldegrave treads on the toes of the mighty

Neither William Waldegrave nor his fellow junior government minister David Mellor looks exactly cast in the mould of a political gladiator.

Which prompts us to speculate on why each, in his turn, has recently come out with public statements about Israel which have outraged World Jewry.

First, Mr. Mellor, while visiting the Palestinian West Bank, commented scathingly on the brutality of the Israeli troops there in their treatment of the Palestinian insurgents. Then, a short time later, Mr. Waldegrave had the temerity, when meeting Yasser Arafat in Tunis, to remark that, amid all the talk about Arab terrorism, it should not be forgotten that a number of today's Israeli leaders, including Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir, were once themselves terrorists.

Are these two representatives of the Thatcher Government so wet behind the ears that they do not know who are the bosses of the present world scene? Has Mrs. Thatcher never told them the realities of modern international politics, and whom they are allowed to offend and whom not?

Or was there some method in their heresies — were they in fact saying things that their Government wanted said but did not want to be seen saying at the very highest level?

One clue as to what might be happening was provided by a leader article in *The Mail on Sunday* of January 15th, which spoke angrily of the role of the Foreign Office in the present Middle Eastern embroglio and said:-

"Out of a mixture of supposed British national interest, vanity, anti-semitism and ignorance, the FO has stood against Israel since its foundation more than 40 years ago."

These words are of course quite laughable — vanity and ignorance may well rule much of the doings of the Foreign Office, but as for the British national interest and 'anti-semitism' — no way! The Foreign Office for the last 40 years or so has merely been the arm of one after another weak British Government accustomed to bowing to international pressure, from whatever source it has come.

For most of this time it has been Jewish Zionist pressure that has far outweighed all others. Now, just possibly, that is changing.

What most certainly has been happening all around the globe is that there has been a

Contd. on page 18

COCK AND BULL FROM LORD COCKFIELD

JOHN TYNDALL analyses the philosophy of Britain's 'Mr. Europe', as revealed in a newspaper interview

LORD COCKFIELD, for the past few years the Commissioner for the Internal Market of the EEC, apparently prefers his name to be pronounced as 'Co-field' — which, in the light of a recent press interview he gave on the subject of Europe, is perhaps less appropriate than the name as spelt — for no greater farrago of rubbish can I recall ever having seen come out of Fleet Street and its environs.

Lord Cockfield was speaking to the *Daily Mail*, and the subject in question was 1992, the year in which the next stages towards full European integration are scheduled to be negotiated. The noble Lord, as many will know, has recently been recalled by Mrs. Thatcher from his EEC post, supposedly on the grounds that his Europeanism was too enthusiastic and too strong even for the present Government. We should therefore perhaps not have been surprised to hear from him a collection of clichés, half-truths and idle fantasies thoroughly typical of an identikit internationalist. In the event, Lord 'Co-field' performed as might be predicted.

His Lordship began by dealing with the question: "Why is it vital that Britain becomes a fully committed member of the post-1992 Europe?" In reply he said:-

"The next century is going to be the century of the superpowers: the Soviet Union, the United States, China, Japan and Europe. Unless you are a superpower, your views are not taken into account and your interest disregarded.

"Despite all the rhetoric, Britain will not get its way in the world unless it does it as a part of a United Europe. We're not big enough. We haven't got the economic strength or the defence muscle — not by ourselves."

The next century is going to be the century of the superpowers — just what is that supposed to mean? Has not every century since the dawn of history been one in which those states that were the strongest powers of their time were able to exert the greatest weight and do the most to determine events? What is so different about the century to come? Most certainly, power is, as always, a vital factor in world politics — the vital one in fact, and Lord Cockfield is really telling us nothing that is very original when he reminds us that this is so. He conveniently skates round the central question, however, which is that of how Britain will be best placed to hold her own in such a world. He merely says that we will not get our way unless we do so as part

of a united Europe. What makes him think that we will get our way even in that event? By what stretch of imagination can a nation of 56 million be presumed to be able to 'get its way' within a bloc of nations around a dozen in number and comprising populations totalling over 300 million? The very idea would be a nonsense if we were strategically situated so as to give us a central position in Europe; it is all the more a nonsense when we are placed on Europe's periphery.



LORD COCKFIELD
Authentic voice of internationalism

Just accepting the purely hypothetical view that an integrated Europe will represent sufficiently strong a state to 'get its way' in world affairs, whatever that may mean, just what will be the value of such an event to Britain if her voice within Europe is no greater than, for instance, that of the county of Yorkshire is within Britain itself, or the land of Schleswig-Holstein is within the Federal Republic of Germany? In short, Lord Cockfield is talking pure piffle. The first requirement of 'getting one's way' is to be in sovereign control of one's own destiny. That elementary requirement being satisfied, of course the more powerful one is the more weight one carries; but without the basic ingredient of sovereignty 'getting one's way' is pure fantasy.

As for Lord Cockfield's assertion that

Britain is 'not big enough', this can only be dealt with by asking: not big enough for what? If the noble Lord is asserting that we are not big enough to order the world according to our designs one can only ask him: why should we wish to anyway? I suppose it takes an internationalist to think in terms of 'ordering the world' — such imperatives being, in the minds of these species, indispensable barriers against the advent of destruction and disaster for all humanity. To me, as a nationalist, it is sufficient that Britain may be empowered to order her own fate, and not have it decided by others. Sweden, Switzerland, Iceland, Korea, Taiwan, Singapore, Chile, Uruguay and — yes — even tiny Iceland all seem to be perfectly capable of achieving survival in that context; why should Britain, which is larger than all of them, not be able to do so?

'POOLING SOVEREIGNTY'

It was to be expected that Lord Cockfield would be asked, in his interview, a question about sovereignty, and of course it was to be expected that he would deal with it in the time-honoured fashion of Euro-fanatics from Edward Heath onwards. To the question of Britain losing her sovereignty as the new Europe develops, he replied:-

"Any international agreement involves some sacrifice of national sovereignty. Being a member of the United Nations represents giving up an element of one's own sovereignty. But we will give up less by being part of Europe because we are essentially pooling our sovereignty..."

Needless to say, the assertion that "any international agreement involves some sacrifice of national sovereignty" is sheer poppycock. Mere international agreements can be withdrawn from at any time that any of the parties decide that such agreements are no longer compatible with their interests. As for the United Nations, since when has this involved giving up 'an element of one's own sovereignty'? The United Nations Organisation possesses neither legislative nor executive power; we have the right to ignore the way its members vote, as indeed we did on the question of the Falklands War.

As for 'pooling' our sovereignty, the proposition that that means anything other than sacrificing it is nonsense. By putting anything into a pool under rules by which one cannot withdraw it when one wishes, one is in effect surrendering it — there can be no other

Contd. on next page

interpretation. This phrase about 'pooling sovereignty' was of course one fondly used by Edward Heath when he was taking us into the EEC in the early 1970s. It was dishonest balderdash then and it is dishonest balderdash now.

SINGLE CURRENCY

The subject of a common European currency was the next one to occupy the mind of His Lordship. Asked what would be the effect on Britain of her non-acceptance of such a currency, he said:-

"We would impose on our own trade and industry costs which would not be incurred by any other people in Europe. We would become less competitive and sell fewer goods. We would become poorer. At the same time there is a serious risk that the financial centre of Europe might well move away from London."

As a demonstration of the art of *non sequitur* this really takes some beating! Of what costs is Lord Cockfield talking? If he means the costs that bankers charge for the conversion of one national currency into another, is he seriously suggesting that these bankers are somehow going to forfeit the profits they derive from such transactions when a common European currency is adopted? If this were the case, the idea of a common currency would be opposed fiercely by the whole international banking fraternity. Not only is this not happening but indeed that international banking fraternity is in the very forefront of the forces egging us on to greater European integration, including the adoption of a common European currency. Indeed, given the banking system that is presently instituted in the European nations, such a common currency would make the bankers masters of all Europe, for it is they who would determine just how much 'European' money was to be in circulation at any given time.

That Britain would sell fewer goods within

Europe in the event of her not being a part of the common currency scheme may well be so, but the opposite side of the coin is that Europeans would sell fewer goods in Britain. At the present time Europeans are benefiting far more from their access to the British market than we are benefiting from our access to the market of Europe. The loss of such a development as that to which Lord Cockfield refers would be felt far more by European exporters to Britain than by British exporters to Europe.

As for Lord Cockfield's last assertion, that the financial centre of Europe might well move away from London, we may say that the British economy as a whole has benefited very little from London being Europe's financial centre: it has not done the slightest in the way of making British industry stronger and more competitive *vis-a-vis* the industries of Europe. A nation's economic strength rests basically on the strength of its manufacturing; it will be through the resurgence of British manufacturing that the British economy will recover. No-one has ever produced the slightest evidence that a nation's place as an international financial centre bore any relation whatsoever to its rating among the manufacturing powers.

SPOOFING THE PEOPLE

Lord Cockfield was then asked if he thought the British would want to give up their money, given its symbolic significance as a token of nationhood. He replied:-

"National reaction against change is understandable because you are changing long-standing traditions. But it is possible that symbolic things can be accommodated with national symbols on coins and notes the way the Scots have their symbols on their notes."

The message here is abundantly clear: let the British have little pictures of the Queen on their European banknotes and they will be

satisfied that it is still their money! Here we see the olympian contempt of the 'elitist' for the common multitude. Lord Cockfield seems quite content to insult the intelligence of the British people by presuming that they would be content to have their money adorned with pretty pictures illustrating some British theme, even if effective control over that money had been surrendered to a bureaucracy overseas. This is the kind of lie one tells to children to persuade them to accept something one believes is good for them but which one recognises that they wouldn't accept if it were presented to them honestly. But of course to the Lord Cockfields of this world the people are all children who have to be given lollipops to distract their attention from things less pleasant. A true professional liberal is our friend Lord Cockfield!

NONSENSE ON NATIONAL IDENTITY

Next subject on the agenda was the identity issue — always something of a red herring where questions of national sovereignty are concerned. Would we lose our identity by becoming part of an integrated Europe? His Lordship's reply was of course predictable:-

"It is total nonsense. The Scots remain just as fiercely Scottish whether they remain in Scotland or come to work in England. The same is true of the Welsh. They do not lose their national identity. We no more intend in Europe that the French or the Germans or the British should lose their national identity than the Scots, the Welsh or indeed the English..."

What Lord Cockfield is revealing here is that he utterly fails to perceive the essential difference between the Scottish, Welsh or English identity within Britain and that of the British as a whole within Europe — or indeed the world. The British — as distinct from the purely Scottish, Welsh or English — identity is inextricably tied up with the status of sovereignty. Scots, Welsh, English and Northern Irish elements have gradually merged, by a process taking place over centuries, into a **British Nation** — a nation that is real for the precise reason that the majority of its members, in all parts, believe and feel it to be real. No such thing as a 'European Nation' exists in any parallel form. It is as dishonest to tell Germans or Frenchmen that they would not be sacrificing their national identity by joining a European super state as it is to tell Britons the same thing. Their identity, like ours, is something of which national freedom and sovereignty are integral parts — otherwise why would they have fought fierce wars at a comparatively recent stage of history to preserve those things? These nations can no more preserve their identity by giving up their freedom than can a yeoman remain a yeoman by becoming a serf.

Lord Cockfield, to be fair to him, did get close to the truth when asked whether his views on European integration had changed



FOREIGN INVASION OF THE HIGHWAY

Today most of the motor vehicles on Britain's roads are imported. If we left the EEC, we might sell less cars and lorries to Europe, but this loss would be far outweighed by the gains that our motor industry would make in the home market

Contd. overleaf

COCK AND BULL FROM LORD COCKFIELD

(Contd. from prev. page)

since he went to Brussels as a British Commissioner, this being implied by the widening difference of opinion on Europe between him and the Government that had appointed him. He said:-

"It's the Government which has changed, not me. When I was asked to take this post we had just had the Fontainebleau Summit, which had solved what were thought to be the outstanding problems. Everyone said: 'We have put these problems behind us. We as Europeans are going ahead.' 'So it was in the spirit of relaunching Europe that I accepted this appointment. That, at the time, was the outlook and attitude of the British Government. In effect what I have done is to remain consistent but the Government has changed.'"

Asked why he thought this had happened, Lord Cockfield alluded to the Government's embarrassments over VAT, which the Eurocrats had been demanding be extended over an increasing range of goods and services in Britain and which would most certainly be electorally unpopular in this country. He then continued:-

"But it goes much deeper than that. I believe the Falklands War has had a very big effect in feeding English nationalism. And in particular it fed the nationalism of the Prime Minister who, after all, was the general who won the war (*sic!*). She was not just a politician who sat at home; she was virtually the general who won the war and it is not surprising it should have moulded her outlook.

"It was absolutely necessary to fight that war and to stand up against what was naked aggression. But the repercussions of that war have been much greater than people realise. I'm not going to speculate on new Conservative governments, but I believe a new government would probably have a new outlook."

What Lord Cockfield is clearly saying here is that Mrs. Thatcher was made acutely aware, through the Falklands War, of the great political mileage to be gained by tapping the wellsprings of a latent nationalism in this country. Leaving aside the preposterous assertion that the Prime Minister was "the general who won the war," it is certainly true to say that she was the politician who derived the greatest benefit from the victory. Margaret Thatcher, whatever else we may say of her, is shrewd enough a political pro to be able to gauge in what sectors of the population lie her main sources of support: she knows that they lie among the most patriotically inclined — an unmerited truth, most certainly, but a truth nevertheless. Undoubtedly, the Premier's attitudes on Europe in subsequent years have been conditioned by this understanding.

This is not to say that Mrs. Thatcher's actual intentions with regard to Europe are fundamentally different from those of Lord

Cockfield; it does mean, however, that Mrs. Thatcher can less afford to be frank with the people in her declarations of where the European path is leading than can her late Commissioner. He, now at least, has nothing to lose by speaking his mind; she has a great deal to lose by speaking hers.

It is therefore probable that Lord Cockfield has fallen out of favour with the Prime Minister solely because, in his manner in spelling out clearly what the policy objectives of the EEC are, he has become an embarrassment to the Government, which would far rather the British public be sleepwalked into European integration, not knowing that it is happening to them until the deed is done, than be confronted with the bald truth of the thing they are getting into, and perhaps recoiling at the prospect.

NO POWER TO LEAD

Lord Cockfield concluded the interview in much the same style as he had handled it throughout: by empty sloganising and waffle that would not stand up to two minutes' serious examination. "I have," he said, "a very strong national feeling, much stronger than most Englishmen. And I want to see my country leading Europe. That is the way my nationalism is reflected."

It is about time that someone told Lord Cockfield and others like him that in the real world leadership goes to those who represent the strongest power. Britain is not, and never in the nature of things can be, the strongest power in Europe. Britain's power has always rested, not on her European connections, but on her oceanic ones. As long as she was the centre of a strong and united Empire, she could, in concert with the peoples of that Empire, comprise an aggregate of power as strong as any in Europe — but not in a way that would ever have enabled her to 'lead' Europe. Leadership of Europe requires a predominance of power within Europe itself — that is to say that the power represented by a nation's European population, territory and resources is the power that counts most in the question of whether it can lead Europe or not. Seen in this context, the inevitable leader of a unified Europe — if there is ever such a thing — would be Germany, presuming that that nation will eventually itself be reunified. With the present combined populations of East and West Germany, and without bringing Austria and other borderlands into the reckoning, Germany has approximately 77 million, as compared with Britain's 56 million — and this is apart from the strategic consideration of Germany being in the heart of Europe while Britain is on the periphery.

But the fact that Britain can never command the power to lead Europe does not mean that she can never be powerful again — indeed as powerful, in global terms, as any European nation.

As a strongly governed, racially regenerate, economically dynamic and efficiently organised island, we can certainly

attain what power is necessary to survive. We can, however, do more than just that.

By stepping back from Europe and distancing ourselves from its economics and its politics, remaining friendly and co-operative but separate and sovereign, we can place ourselves in a position to take the first steps towards a renewal of our once-strong family ties with our kith and kin across the globe, who turned their backs on us essentially because we first turned our backs on them — in our lemming drive towards the EEC which began in the 1950s.

With such ties restored, we could contemplate an alliance of peoples that would have the potential of real power — because it would be one based, to a very large extent, on racial affinity, shared language, shared history and shared interest. If, as Lord Cockfield would have us do, we contemplate the coming of the 21st century, we may conclude that such an alliance has more chance of surviving than do some of the so-called 'superpowers' of which he speaks. What price the 'superpower' of the Soviet Union, with its festering conflict between its many and diverse nationalities and ethnic groups? What price the 'superpower' of the United States, with its melting pot of peoples, white, black and Hispanic? And what price the 'superpower' of Lord Cockfield's Europe — when Frenchmen, Germans, Italians and others realise, as they are certain to do, that they are not one people, with one interest and one loyalty, but diverse peoples thrown together in an unnatural marriage by rootless politicians and financiers? Will any of these gigantic conglomerates survive the century that is to come? I am one of those who believe that we, once we have discovered again what it is to be a **nation**, and once we have regained the instinct to **act** as a nation ought to act, will probably survive better.

WHAT CONSTITUTES POWER?

If the century in which we are now living has provided any lesson concerning what constitutes power, it is that an efficiently governed and racially unified state in the cruiserweight division can be more than a match for superheavyweights that lack good government and are racially diverse — unless the latter combine together so that their resources are so overwhelming as to enable them to overpower anybody and anything.

We British, if we can recover our racial homogeneity, acquire an efficient system of government dedicated to the national weal and then achieve some measure of cohesion in world affairs with our ethnic kinsmen across the oceans, would be able to become just such a power of cruiserweight rank. As such, we would join Japan and a reunified Germany, which in the 21st century would comprise powers of roughly the same rank. In terms of the qualities needed for survival in that century, my money would be on these cruiserweights — rather than the superheavyweights by whom Lord Cockfield seems so mesmerised as he looks into the future.

RESISTING THE HURD INSTINCT

Scathing commentary on a wet Home Secretary

ALMOST UNBELIEVABLY, Home Secretary Douglas Hurd's response to the mounting crime rate is to leave as many criminals as possible free to prey on the community. His strategy is double-pronged. Firstly, the weakling is encouraging magistrates to use prison only as a last resort, preferring 'punishment in the community' — that is, no punishment at all. Even if a few people are actually sent to prison on conviction, they are usually transferred quickly to a soft billet at a (quite literally) open prison, such as that at Ford in Sussex, where 96 men absconded last year, including a violent inmate who had committed 46 offences while in jail, and a terrorist from Ulster, who had been raising funds for the republican cause by the time-honoured Fenian method of armed robbery.

Our wretched bleeding heart of a Home Secretary has evidently decided that punishing criminals is too nasty a task for him to contemplate. Therefore he should resign, since he has already effectively abdicated authority. Unfortunately, he will cling on to office (about the only thing politicians, with all their talk of 'caring', do care about), and prescribe liberal nostrums that might have been acceptable to students in the Sociology Department of the University of Sussex in 1968, but are utterly divorced from reality.

The latest drivel to spew from Hurd's mouth is a reassertion, in July of last year, of his claim that better parenthood is the way to beat crime! A stern fatherly talk, perhaps, for the Rasta who tried to cut off a policeman's head with a Samurai sword? Since Fathers' Day is proverbially the most confusing day of the year in some areas of London and our other inner cities, problems of identification might make paternal ticking off rather difficult to arrange!

I'M ALRIGHT, DOUGLAS!

On a more serious note, Hurd's advocacy of quack remedies is symptomatic of the Government's complete abdication of its responsibility for the maintenance of law and order. The Government is now trying to 'pass the buck' to the population as a whole, while at the same time people who defend themselves with swordsticks against muggers on the tube are arrested and threatened with imprisonment by a police force and a judiciary that are quite incapable themselves of protecting the law-abiding majority against the criminal minority.

Hurd's latest excess to make illegal any weapon that a man or woman might carry for the purpose of self-defence against muggers and rapists. CS gas aerosol sprays, commonly used in France and the USA as anti-mugging

Reproduced with acknowledgements to ROUND ROBIN, obtainable from PO Box 850, London W14 8EN.

devices, are now illegal under the Nanny Hurd terror, and the new and curiously misnamed Criminal Justice Bill will make it an offence so much as to possess any one of a whole range of defensive weapons. Hurd and his family are of course protected in their fortress-like luxury home by a 24-hour heavily armed guard of Special Branch men, so he personally has nothing to worry about!

Hurd is clearly either too stupid, or too wilfully blind, to realise that his unenforceable new laws will do nothing to prevent



HURD
While he has
been in office,
law and order
have collapsed
yet further

criminals from carrying knives, or revolvers for that matter. Criminals are by definition people who disobey the law! The only effect of Nanny Hurd's stupid meddling will be to take from potential victims their means of defending themselves, their families and their homes.

A refusal to discharge the basic duty of the state to its citizens is common to both the 'One Nation' left of the Conservative Party, of which Hurd is a good example, and the demented libertarian right, which would quite happily privatise the police and the judiciary, such is the extent of its madness! Readers who were present at the AGM of the London Swinton Circle will know what we mean. They had the opportunity to hear the loopy remarks of Mrs. Teresa Gorman, MP, who appears sincerely to believe that the only function of the state is to provide a framework in which free enterprise will flourish. Thatcherite philosophy will, Mrs. Gorman assured us, thereafter promptly solve all social problems! This is a manifest nonsense

A strict observance of the written laws is doubtless one of the high duties of a good citizen; but it is not the highest. The laws of necessity, of self-preservation, of saving our country when in danger, are of higher obligation. To lose our country by scrupulous adherence to written law would be to lose law itself, with life, liberty, property and all those who are enjoying them with us, thus absurdly sacrificing the end to the means.

Thomas Jefferson

— it is blatantly obvious that the richer you are the more attractive a target for robbery you present. Gorman's absurd conclusion is the consequence of applying an economic theory to the social and political spheres — to which Adam Smith never for one moment intended that it should be applied. To say that, because the centrally planned economy is largely inferior to the market economy, the state has no social role to play, and that some kind of spontaneous social order will arise in the absence of state action, is not only an egregious *non sequitur* but also a recipe for anarchy, a condition under which life is nasty, brutish and short.

NOT SO NOBLE SAVAGES

The libertarian view that, in the absence of state action, a spontaneous social order will arise is clearly derived from Rousseau's concept of the 'noble savage', the idea that human beings in a state of nature are gentle, kindly and well adjusted. The idea is attractive, but unfortunately it is utterly incompatible with all anthropological data. The only exception, the work of Margaret Mead in Samoa, has been conclusively discredited. Man in his natural state is violent, selfish and cruel, and only the constant vigilance of a civilised and civilising *elite* can prevent a relapse into barbarism, where the only law is the law of the jungle. Ruthlessness in the pursuit of order is no vice, as every civilising force in Europe, from Draco to Queen Victoria's judges, has recognised. That is a lesson that we clearly have to learn anew — and fast.

It is ultimately the state's responsibility to enforce laws made by the legislature on behalf of the whole community. It is not possible to tolerate a plurality of moral codes in the same society, and those who deviate from the accepted code of behaviour and right conduct that we call law must be punished. Individuals cannot be given the freedom each to make their own moral judgements with impunity. What if a man thinks it right to rape, or rob, or murder? Nor is it acceptable to say that citizens must defend themselves as best they can against criminals. This attitude leaves the frail old lady face-to-face with the brutal thug. Society is collectively responsible for enforcing the collective moral code, and the agencies of the state, the representatives of society, are charged with this task.

In the last analysis, the buck stops with the Home Secretary, who is responsible for the maintenance of law and order, and with the Prime Minister, who appoints the Home Secretary. If law and order are breaking down, these two must answer for their bad stewardship. They are the servants of the British people, not our masters.

GETTING HISTORY RIGHT

THE EDITOR writes to an angry reader about the Churchill legend

Dear

I am in receipt of your letter of the 3rd January in which you say you do not propose to renew your subscription because of what you describe as "the continual denigration in *Spearhead* of Sir Winston Churchill and all that he stood for."

Of course, we have had all this out before, and you will remember that then I went to some lengths to dissuade you from your decision to discontinue your support. I do not propose to attempt to do so again, but I will make just a few comments just for the sake of the record.

First of all, to speak of 'continual denigration' of Churchill is to be in error. It is not very often that this magazine has anything to say about that personage, and when something has been said it has represented simply the view of the individual writer about past history, whereas what *Spearhead* is mainly concerned about is the present and the future. In my book *The Eleventh Hour* I have said: "Least of all should those who are able to unite over the questions of what should be done today oblige their common enemies by falling out over what was done half a century ago." (Chapt. 4, page 89). I think this point of some importance; in our struggle to do something to create a lifeline for Britain in this desperate hour of her need we must somehow enlist the support of many varieties of people who, among other things, are the products of different generations, each with their particular models, idols and value systems. These different generations are bound to see past events in different perspective, and it is much better that we should not allow these perspectives of the past to sidetrack us from the imperatives of the present and future.

LOCATING THE WRONG TURNS

That does not for one moment mean, however, that the past is of no relevance; we must think about it and discuss it if we are to locate the vital turnings where Britain has taken the wrong road. Therefore the matter of World War II, and the leading personages involved in it, is bound to crop up. Hence the opinions that have been published about Churchill, Roosevelt and others.

You have written under your name at the bottom of your letter the words 'Royal Navy'. From this I detect that you are trying to tell me something which, perhaps in your view, puts me in my place. I detect that you belong to the generation that did the fighting in World War II. Let me say straightaway that I respect that generation as being probably a better one, on average, in manhood and in character than those that have followed it — just as, in all

The price of losing valued readers and supporters is one that our magazine sometimes has to pay for being outspoken, and in particular for the debunking of certain popular myths. Recently a reader wrote to say that he was severing his connections with us because he was offended at the articles critical of Sir Winston Churchill. This was regrettable because the same reader, in addition to subscribing to SPEARHEAD, had also on one occasion made a handsome donation to the funds of the British National Party. In view of this latter fact, our Editor took the time to send him a detailed and comprehensive reply. We are printing this reply here, with the name of the ex-reader deleted, as we feel it may be of interest to other readers.

probability, the generation that did the fighting in 1914-18 displayed those qualities to an even greater degree.

But none of this means that your generation necessarily showed good judgement in its choice of what British people should fight for, with whom they should fight and against what and whom they should fight. The overwhelming fact that must be recognised concerning World War II is that it led to the exhaustion and bankruptcy of Britain, the disintegration of the British Empire and the triumph of Soviet Communism. I submit to you that when the time comes to judge the plus or minus to this nation of personages like Churchill it is not merely the stirring flavour of his writings or speeches, nor the infectious fighting spirit of his personality, that must be weighed into the balance; it is above all the

long-term national impact of his actual decisions. And it is the view of the authors whose condemnations you resent that Churchill's decisions and judgement in those vital years in which he held power were to have disastrous consequences for Britain, the British Empire and the British Race.

THE POST-WAR FRAMEWORK

You may say, in reply to this, that the decisions making for national ruin in the post-war years were made, not by Churchill, but by others coming after him. That of course is largely true but not wholly so; these latter political leaders, whatever we may say about their personal limitations, were compelled to operate within a national and international framework conditioned by a world which Churchill did so much to create: a world of British financial insolvency and American economic hegemony and Soviet military predominance, a world of lies and mass deception, a world of colonial insurgency, a world suffering from the appalling genetic loss brought about by the slaughter of so many of Britain's and Europe's best elements of manhood.

You will say, perhaps, that Churchill could not have chosen any other path in view of the menace of Germany and the need to mobilise all available forces and allies to deal with it. But I will say that here lies the most monumental misjudgement of all — and the one for which Churchill above all was guilty: that there was in fact a German 'menace' that threatened harm to this country and its Empire. I am one of those who believe that there was no such thing, that Germany's and

Contd. on next page



YALTA: CHURCHILL WITH HIS WARTIME BUDDIES

Hitler's intentions towards the British were entirely peaceful and conciliatory, and that therefore war with Germany and Hitler could have been avoided. I furthermore believe that, even after that catastrophic war had been embarked upon and Hitler's forces had trounced our own and those of the French in 1940, we had an opportunity — extended to us by Hitler — to conclude an honourable peace that would have left our country, our sovereignty and our Empire intact, and that we rejected it — Churchill indeed being the principal agent of this rejection.

FINDING OUT THE TRUTH

All these facts are admirably documented in David Irving's book *Churchill's War*. You will recall that a review of this book was printed in *Spearhead*, and I have no doubt that this was one of the examples you had in mind when you spoke in your letter of our 'denigration' of Churchill. But I would ask

you: have you read the book? And, if you have, can you produce **evidence** to refute what the author says?

What I suspect is the case is that you have not seriously examined the true facts of Winston Churchill's career, least of all seriously thought through the consequences of his actions and policies, but that you are guided only by a strictly **emotional** memory of his wartime oratory, his high-sounding patriotic words, his seemingly bulldog mien and, above all, the popular **image** of him as a national hero portrayed by the mass media of the time. You perhaps recall the Churchill days as being days when the nation seemed to have a unity and a purpose, when it was probably in better fighting mettle than now, and when it was led by a person who was better able to stir the national spirit than any of his successors. These are all memories which, quite understandably, evoke more pleasing thoughts than the picture of Britain as she is in 1989.

But none of this is a substitute for cool, clear-headed **judgement**. The criterion of judgement compels us to recognise that the ghastly mess that we are in today is the direct consequence of disastrous decisions made yesterday, the most disastrous of these being the decisions made in 1939, 1940 and 1941 that Hitler was our enemy and Stalin and Roosevelt were our friends. Those decisions shaped the world in which today we have to live. Most of your generation approved them.

With this I must, reluctantly, part company with you and say goodbye. I feel it justified to go to this length to express my views on the matter you have raised because I am mindful that you have helped us generously in the past. We will always be grateful to you for this help, and that makes it all the more regrettable that we must now go our separate ways.

Yours sincerely
John Tyndall

THE MIDDLE EAST: WHO ARE THE REAL TERRORISTS?

NORMAN WHITE gives the background to the present talks

IN THE MURKY LABYRINTH of Middle Eastern politics, the guise of those who give shape to policy formulated in the inner councils of the various factions and states is obscure — and necessarily so. For in this oil-rich and turbulent cockpit rent by division and visceral hatred is to be found the geographical focus of Jewry, set down in the region 40 years ago by the democracies without regard or concern for the lands, homes or lives of the indigenous Palestinian Arab people. Resentment at this process festered into implacable opposition, which erupted into armed conflict on three different occasions — from all of which the artificial Jewish state of Israel, itself conceived and born through repeated acts of terrorism, emerged triumphant, armed and sustained by its midwives of the world's democracies.

The vanquished and the dispossessed in this region have been brutally subjugated and herded, hungry and homeless, into refugee camps which, for many, became charnel houses in which they were slaughtered by the pursuing arm of Zionist terror. The names of these camps, at present largely unknown to the world, will one day replace the Zionist-inspired roll call of so-called Nazi extermination camps which has been incessantly plugged through two generations: Nabatieh and Ainel-Helweh, razed to the ground after many of the refugees living in them had been

killed; Nahr al-Bared and Hazzieh, repeatedly subjected to bombing in which numerous Palestinian families were slaughtered; Sabra and Chatila, in which up to 1,500 defenceless men, women and children were massacred in a single afternoon in September 1982.

"The terrorists of yesterday have since become prime ministers, foreign ministers, generals and other VIPs of the Israeli state today, and the armies that brought Israel its 'liberation' and widely employed terror — the Haganah, Irgun Zvai Leumi and the Stern Gang — have become the victorious armies of Israel today." The words of an Arab 'anti-semitic'? No, those of a non-Zionist Jew, Alfred Lilienthal, in his book *The Zionist Connection*.

The Zionist state terror machine has demonstrated criminal disregard for every tenet of international law throughout its 40-year existence. After Zionists had devised the letter bomb prior to 1948, when it was used against British politicians and the Palestine Police Force, it was subsequently deployed against American politicians and against Jewish officials in the US (but always conveniently discovered before exploding), against German scientists working in Egypt and against Palestinian scholars, poets, writers, intellectuals and of course *Fedayeen*.

Adolf Eichmann and Mordecai Vanunu



ARAFAT

By his conciliatory stance, he has put the Israelis in a tricky position

were abducted from Argentina and Italy respectively, in blatant and contemptuous disregard of extradition processes. John Demjanjuk has been subjected to an illegal show trial in (most appropriately) a Tel Aviv theatre on the trumped-up charge of having been a guard at Treblinka, and convicted on the evidence of forged KGB documents and

Contd. overleaf

THE MIDDLE EAST: WHO ARE THE REAL TERRORISTS?

(Contd. from prev. page)

of Jewish 'eyewitnesses' (after nearly half a century!). The American ship, the *Liberty*, was severely damaged in the Eastern Mediterranean in 1967 by rocket and machine gun attack carried out by the Israeli Air Force when the ship was in international waters. Beirut and many other towns and villages in the Lebanon have been bombed and rocketed by the same Israeli Air Force, as was the Osirak nuclear reactor at Tuwaitha near the Iraqi capital of Baghdad, over 500 miles from Israeli territory. The Lebanon was invaded in 1982 and havoc was wreaked on the homes and land of Arab peoples, to say nothing of the immense loss of life as a result of shelling, rocketing and machine gunning by the Israeli armed forces. Imagine the reaction of the democracies if it was Israel being invaded and destroyed under, say, Syrian assault!

In addition, the state terror machine of Israel has repeatedly exhibited its malicious hatred of the Palestinian Arab populace by bulldozing and blowing up countless houses, villages and towns in which those people have lived. The Syrian city of Quneitra, capital of the Golan Heights area, was razed to the ground and entirely demolished, with the water wells filled with diesel oil, before Israeli armed forces withdrew under the terms of the disengagement accord with Syria in June 1967.

In such a setting, where assassinations, duplicity and intrigue flourish like fungi in a dank jungle, and treacherous impostures are as natural as the white adobe buildings of the region, the media provide an almost wholly one-sided account of events. The result is that most people instinctively associate every act of terrorism in, or arising from, the area with the Palestinian Arabs or the various sects of Muslims. This, after all, is how we have been programmed to react — exactly as we do when the word 'nazi' is employed. Persistent indoctrination through two generations have produced the exact response required from the *Goyim*. Never mind the killings, the tortures, the bombings and the assassinations perpetrated by the so-called Israeli 'Defence' Force, by Mossad, by Shin Beth and by the 'Christian Militia' of Sa'ad Haddad. All of these atrocities, massacres and murders are played down or completely disregarded and forgotten by the world's media — for reasons which of course we know!

PEACE INITIATIVE

Came November 1988 and the Palestinian Liberation Organisation (PLO) achieved a significant breakthrough in its 24-year effort to obtain justice, recognition and restoration of the Palestinian people's homeland. Following a year-long uprising by the 1.6 million population of the occupied territories of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, during which well over 300 unarmed youths, men, women and children were killed by the armed

forces of Israel, the Palestinian National Council declared the existence of an independent state of Palestine at its meeting in Algiers on November 15th 1988. Even so, this embryonic state occupies only a part of the former territory of Palestine, and many historic Arab towns, like Jaffa, Haifa, Lod and Ramleh, are abandoned to the Jewish state. Nonetheless, this portentous political act has created worldwide tremors and brought instant recognition in many quarters.

The most stunning outcome so far is that the USA has agreed to begin talks with Yasser Arafat, Chairman of the PLO, after he had succumbed to international pressure and accepted the terms of UN Resolution 242, acknowledging the sovereignty and



SHAMIR

40 years ago a leading terrorist (as seen in this picture), he is now Prime Minister of Israel

independence of every state in the region, recognised the existence of the state of Israel and committed the PLO to negotiate a settlement, renouncing terrorism and seeking a "just and durable peace."

It goes without saying that the "terrorists of yesterday," ensconced in their positions of state power in Israel, were deeply shocked and angered by this bold piece of diplomacy by the Palestinian National Council. They had been outmanoeuvred in what amounted to a severe diplomatic reversal. The United States, their ally (or puppet, as some contend), had had the effrontery to parly with the hated enemy PLO, leaving the Israelis potentially isolated and exposed. "The most painful slap in the face that has been inflicted on Israel since its creation." That was how one Israeli newspaper, *Hadashot*, put it. The consensus of opinion within Israel — government, army, media and public — is that the state's long-term position and future are seriously endangered. So what was to be done?

Obviously, the declaration of an independent Palestinian state was vigorously rejected at government level and in diplomatic circles. Arafat's speech to the UN at Geneva was denigrated as an act of "monumental deception" by the Israeli Premier. In addition, the worldwide Zionist movement was activated into repudiating this

daring step, intensifying the vilification of the PLO and all Palestinian groups, pouring scorn on their new course of moderation and warning of the likelihood of continued terrorism, both by the PLO and by those hostile to Arafat's perceived sell-out. To such an end, the Zionist movement has employed and exploited the world's media, as ever.

In Britain, Lionel Kopelowitz, President of the Board of Deputies of British Jews, 'urged' our own Government not to be drawn into a "monumental trap" (note the curiously repeated use of the word 'monumental' in these circles) of supporting Arafat. The Government, he cautioned in best finger-wagging style, should "satisfy themselves of Arafat's good intentions before arranging high-level meetings with him."


Duly admonished, our Government, anxious no doubt to avoid another dressing down by the revered and respected and influential Board of Deputies, made sure that William Waldegrave, Minister of State at the Foreign Office, did not meet Arafat when both men coincidentally happened to be in Cairo in December. Having earlier met with Arafat's political advisor, Bassam Abu Sharif, in London, Waldegrave was placed on a short leash by Mrs. Thatcher. At all costs, she wanted to avoid being called in the middle of the night by Lord Jakobovits hissing "Yad Vashem" down the line!

During the course of the next few weeks the Board of Deputies worked out a plan of action which no doubt had the merit of assisting the Government to avoid falling into that 'monumental trap' they had warned about, and at the same time providing the Government with valuable ammunition for future use, with the additional bonus of being seen to act with magnanimity towards the PLO. The Board of Deputies' man, Gerald Kaufman, operating officially as Opposition Front Bench Spokesman on Foreign Affairs, would meet Arafat and discuss his plans for a Palestinian state. That done, the way was clear for the Government itself to test Arafat's 'good intentions' in accordance with Kopelowitz's admonition. So Kaufman met Arafat on January 11th, and Waldegrave followed suit on January 13th. At the time of writing, the question of how Mrs. Thatcher will proceed will depend much on what the Board of Deputies makes of Kaufman's briefing following his assessment of Arafat's 'good intentions'.

LOCKERBIE: WHO WAS RESPONSIBLE?

When Pan Am Flight 103 fell from the sky onto Lockerbie, Scotland, on the night of December 21st, killing 270 people, the terrorism that has arisen out of the Pandora box of International Zionism acutely impacted on Britain as never before. In the aftermath of the devastation that visited Lockerbie that winter's night in 1988 came the speculation as to its cause. Was it malfunction due to mechanical failure, or to

Contd. on next page



metal fatigue? Or was it sabotage? Once it was announced that conclusive evidence pointed to detonating high explosive as being the cause of the break-up of the aircraft, the next question (with ready-made answers provided by the media, of course) was that of who planted the bomb?

Initially, much was made of a phoned warning made to the US Embassy in Helsinki on December 5th by someone reported as being known to US Intelligence and identified by an Arab name. The warning was to the effect that a bomb carried by a woman would be placed aboard a US-bound Pan Am airliner in Frankfurt in the next fortnight. This was played down and dismissed by President Reagan himself on the grounds that threats and warnings relating to bombs on aircraft were commonplace. Then the media informed us whom the intelligence agencies suspected as being behind the sabotage — funny, but I was always led to believe that the secret services shunned disclosures of their operations like bats shunned the light of day. So, on television, over the radio and in the press and other journals, the shopping list of likely suspects was produced, and — surprise! surprise! — they were all Arab and/or Muslim. None was unknown to anyone who even occasionally follows events in the Middle East, for all of them are among the *betes noires* of Israel and the Zionists.

The Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, now split into two factions under Ahmed Jabril and Abu Abbas respectively; the Fatah Uprising of Abu Moussa; the Fatah Revolutionary Command of Abu Nidal; the Hizbollah; the Islamic Jihad; the Guardians of the Iranian Revolution; the Saquia: all were named. Certainly, one of these groups **might** have been behind the explosion aboard Pan Am Flight 103. Certainly too, according to the cruel logic of the revolutionary spiral, the Iranian groups could have regarded themselves as having some justification to avenge the American shooting down of Iran Air A300 Airbus over the Persian Gulf in July 1988, with the loss of life of all 290 passengers and crew aboard. But there is another candidate for inclusion in the identity parade of suspects which has been conspicuous by its omission — and again for reasons which we know!

At the time of the historic first US-PLO exploratory meeting on December 16th, the

PLO political initiative was gathering momentum. In the wake of that meeting, Yassir Abd Rabbo, who led the four-man PLO delegation in Tunis, publicised warnings given to several governments by PLO headquarters of possible acts of terrorism either provoked or committed by the Israelis, who would blame the PLO in an effort to scupper the newly-launched dialogue. Yitzhak Shamir (real name Yezernitsky), former leading member of the Jewish terror group Irgun Zvai Leumi, and now Prime Minister of Israel, has vowed publicly that the Israelis would never negotiate with the PLO and has declared that "if they (the Americans) really talk to the PLO every day they will have a reason to stop."

Mossad, Israel's intelligence service, and Shin Beth, the internal security service, are on record as using every dirty trick in (and out of) the book, and as making use of turncoat Arabs as well as Oriental Jews fluent in Arabic to carry out their work of treachery and deception in the furtherance of their aims. They have operated in many different countries around the world, including our own, and have frequently indulged in *agent-provocateur* activities, such as swastika-daubing of synagogues and, as previously implied, sending letter bombs to Jews — all to direct the wrath of people against their enemies, be they Arabs, Germans or so-called 'neo-nazis'.

By way of illustration, undercover operations by Mossad in Britain were '**officially**' halted by the British Government in July 1988, when it expelled five Israeli agents and two Israeli diplomats following the discovery and trial of another agent. This man turned out to be a 28-year-old Palestinian, Ismail Sowan, who had been working as a research assistant at the Humber College of Education, while also operating as an undercover Mossad agent. He was sentenced at the Old Bailey for illegal possession of weapons and explosives, and received an 11-year term of imprisonment. We can only draw our own conclusions as to the purposes for which these explosives and weapons were intended by Mossad, using a Palestinian.

But we do know the lineage of Mossad and Shin Beth. Both have their origins in the Zionist terrorist gangs of Irgun Zvai Leumi,

THE WRECKAGE AT LOCKERBIE
All the media are speculating on which Arab or Islamic faction was responsible; no-one dares suggest it could have been the Israelis

the Haganah and the Lehi (or Stern Gang), which broke away from Irgun in 1939 under its leader Abraham Stern — later commemorated on a stamp issued by Israel under her previous Prime Minister Menachem Begin, another ex-terrorist. The atrocities perpetrated by these murderous gangs make anything done by Palestinians seem like a mere Saturday night rampage of lager louts.

CATALOGUE OF ZIONIST TERROR

The Haganah ordered the blowing up of a ship in Jaffa harbour in 1940 filled with illegal Jewish immigrants — simply to pin the blame on the British. 276 Jews lost their lives. Another ship was blown up in the Black Sea in 1942 for the same reason. This time 769 Jews were killed. Then from 1944 to 1948 murders and massacres increased in intensity as the Zionists switched their attentions from the Germans to the British, and then to the Palestinian Arab people, in order to achieve their goal: a Jewish state. A British Minister was assassinated in Cairo in 1944. 91 Britons and Arabs were killed when the King David Hotel in Jerusalem was blown up. Another 21 died when the Semiramis Hotel in Jerusalem was also blown up. While all this was happening, some 150 British soldiers and 70 British policemen were murdered — shot in the back, blown up and, in the case of Sergeants Paice and Martin, hanged from trees with their bodies booby-trapped.

The Arab people were uprooted from their homes and lands through terrorist attacks by bomb, explosive and machine gun. The UN Palestine mediator, Count Folke Bernadotte, and his aide, Colonel Andre Serot, were assassinated by the Stern Gang, after the Jewish state had been promulgated. Last year, on the 40th anniversary of the crime, two members of the gang boasted about these killings on Israeli television. But none of these criminals has ever been brought to justice by the Jewish state. On the contrary, two of them have become prime ministers.

But the atrocity which most typifies the treatment of the indigenous Palestinian

Contd. overleaf

THE MIDDLE EAST: WHO ARE THE REAL TERRORISTS?

(Contd. from prev. page)

population prior to the founding of Israel is the massacre at the Arab village of Deir Yassin, where 254 old men, women (including pregnant women) and young children and babies were slaughtered by the combined forces of the Irgun and Stern Gang. Machine guns, grenades and knives were used in the butchery. Women were raped and ripped open. And 150 bodies were thrown down a well, while the rest were piled up by the side of it. Surviving women and girls were herded into open trucks, stripped and then paraded through Jerusalem, where they were

stoned and spat upon. April 9th 1948 is the date of this infamy, but, unlike so many other anniversaries, this one has been erased from memory by the agents of Zionism working in and controlling the world's mass media.

As the sensitive negotiations designed to realise the aspirations of the Palestinian Arab people for an independent homeland on their own territory unfold, it will be invaluable, in understanding what happens over the coming months, to keep in mind these four factors:-

- (1) The use of terror as a means of influencing public opinion and of disrupting international diplomacy.
- (2) The implacable opposition of Israel and Zionism to both the PLO and an independent Palestinian state.
- (3) The leverage exerted by Israel and

Zionism on both the United Kingdom and United States.

(4) The treachery of both the UK and US in their previous dealings with Arabs spanning 70 years, since the secret Sykes-Picot Agreement of 1916, which carved up the Middle East between the British and the French, in repudiation of the promises given to Arab nationalist leaders the year before concerning the independence of all Arab land in the region.

Yasser Arafat will need all the guile, vigilance and immunity for which his career to date has been renowned, if he is to succeed in his dealings with the UK and US negotiators — to say nothing of the Israelis (if he ever gets in the same room with them).

GENETICS AND CULTURE IN A RACIAL NATIONALIST STATE

Part 1 of a three-part essay by TONY WELLS

EDITOR'S NOTE: We are publishing this essay because we believe the related subjects of genetics and eugenics, dealt with in the essay, are of vital importance to the future of Western Civilisation. Not every reader will agree with every proposal the writer puts forward in support of a eugenic programme, and it is right to say that there are some differences of opinion between this editor and the writer on some matters of detail contained in the essay. The essay is being published as a contribution to debate on a crucial subject, not as a policy to be followed by any political party to the absolute letter. This editor is in sympathy with the broad objectives desired by the writer, though he does not necessarily endorse all the methods advocated in pursuit of those objectives. Improvement of our society through racial improvement of the population comprising it is a vital need which we should all recognise and accept. This essay just represents one person's view as to the measures that should be adopted in the pursuit of that need. Though we may argue about the means, we should not be in doubt as to the desirability — indeed the necessity — of the ends.

A EUROPEAN LEADER during an earlier part of this century stressed the need for a revolution that would represent a final step towards the recognition of purely biological values. By this was meant that mankind should recognise that racial improvement, through the upbreeding of the human species, should be seen as the first prerequisite of improvement in the political, economic, social and cultural spheres.

This truth has prompted the writing of this essay on race, culture and genetics. I believe it important that all nationalists understand the fundamentals involved in all of these three terms, why they are necessary and, above all, how they interlink.

Of race, culture and genetics, many racial nationalists have for a long time concentrated on the first, touched a little on the second and completely ignored the third. The fact that such attention has been concentrated on race is not only understandable but absolutely correct — because, quite frankly, in the current climate of 'mass opinion' any concentration on culture and genetics would be viewed as largely irrelevant. Also, all our other policies, far-sighted and often revolutionary though they are, would be worthless unless race were made our first priority. Without the race there is nothing; no amount of economic nationalism or social

improvement will offset a permanent mongrelisation of our people.

The purpose of this essay, therefore, is not to urge any change of strategy or tactics but simply to educate in the deeper implications of the strategy and tactics which we have adopted and on which most agree. The purpose of this is that all nationalists, especially our future leaders, will understand the relationship between race, culture and genetics, and the importance of the latter two concepts, culture and genetics, within the broader racial perspective, so that, given a nationalist assumption of political power, intelligent cultural and genetic programmes may be initiated.

Following the institution of a state based on racial nationalist principles, changes must be made for the radical advancement and increase of our nation's genetic pool. It is hardly necessary to say that the first measure in this field will be to solve the problems created by the presence of alien population groups by a programme of compulsory mass repatriation of the members of those groups.

This is already well understood by all nationalists. Our nation will no longer be conceived of as just a geographical area or an aggregate of individuals sharing a common language and living under common laws; it will be seen first of all as **a people belonging to the same cultural and genetic community**. But it is not enough that our racial house be put in order by the removal of alien population groups; it is vitally necessary that a vast improvement be made in the nation's genetic worth, and that, allied to this, the nation's cultural and moral values change — and in a way that sustains and encourages our genetic advancement, with new morals being developed to maintain the new cultural mould.

One of the primary needs in this respect is that the mass media, the arts and popular entertainment be harnessed to national purposes. To those who would object that this smacks of 'control', we must reply that all these institutions are already 'controlled', in the sense that they are the monopoly of *elitist* minorities and in no way subject to the influence or desires of the common populace; this is only to propose that the nature and source of the control change, so that such institutions properly serve the nation as they should, rather than serving minorities unrepresentative of the nation. Once this process of change is completed, those institutions must be directed with a view to refining popular taste, to the proper education of the people, to the instilling of noble morals and values, to encourage behaviour beneficial to the welfare of the

Contd. on next page



**MOTHER
AND CHILD**
The two in
this picture
represent the
very best in
our race. It
should be our
aim to breed
the maximum
number of
these
elements in
the quest to
improve
society

community and in every way to bring the British people up to a higher moral and cultural level.

What must then follow is that positive eugenic and genetic policies must be implemented by government. This will mean a very significant change from former times, in that the nation's leadership will focus upon an area of human activity which up to that time will have been entirely neglected and left to chance. I am speaking now about procreation, in other words the provision of the quantity and quality of coming generations.

One vital need here will be a fundamental change of national attitudes towards the whole question of having children. In the climate of 'liberalism' now prevailing, the self-centred preferences of the individual are regarded as paramount. We are governed by the familiar claptrap about the "woman's right to control over her own body," etc. with the resultant massive rise in the abortion rate and the massive drop in national fertility. Under 'liberal' teaching, we have entirely lost sight of the truth that it is the duty of every generation to produce succeeding generations. If this latter truth be acknowledged, then the matter of family size (or indeed if there is to be any family at all!) becomes much more than just one to be decided according to individual convenience; it becomes the business of the nation as a whole, and with this comes the moral obligation of healthy and racially sound men and women to ensure to reproduce. As far as government is concerned, this obligation is met by the provision of the strongest possible inducements and encouragements given to men and women of this type (the majority, that is) to breed, and to maintain a climate of moral values in which the duty to reproduce is regarded as being on a par with the 'Ten Commandments'.

AN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE OF EVOLUTION

To understand the need for changes in our society along cultural and genetic lines, it is necessary to follow the path of the evolution of life by natural selection and to pursue these facts through to their logical social consequences, consequences extremely relevant to us in the latter part of the 20th century. For although Darwin's findings on such matters were accepted by most leading biologists within about 30 years of their publication the honest exploration of the social consequences and implications of evolution has still not been widely achieved.

Evolution is operating constantly at all times and on all species, and it works for all these species in basically the same way. The human species is no less a product of evolution than others. Thus over millions of years man has evolved his brain, his muscles, his instincts and his group morality to the civilisation-building stage that he has reached now.

So far as evolution is concerned, some measures of performance are:-

1. Basic ability to survive (given the same environment, it is generally, though not always, true that those species that survive

are better than those that do not).

2. Superior organ complexity and differentiation, i.e. a greater and higher range of organ development, such as that distinguishing the higher from the lower orders of species.

3. Level of prolificacy (this is not to imply that quantity is a more important evolutionary attribute than quality, but only to say that, when two competing groups are qualitatively equal, the one with the greater numbers will be more likely to survive).

4. The breadth of the environment to which the species can adapt.

5. Ability to regulate the environment to the species' advantage.

Different branches of the human species, *Homo Sapiens*, have evolved along very separate paths, and accordingly have not all developed the same capabilities. But that is not the point of this essay, as we are here concerned solely with our own race, the Caucasian, and particularly that part of it which is North European, characterised in the British Isles by a synthesis of Celts, Angles, Saxons, Vikings and Normans.

All species, including North Europeans (until recently at least) have produced too many young, in the sense that fertility has outstripped food supply and resources available in the environment. The result has been that many young have died before producing any offspring of their own — through starvation, disease or other natural hazards. **And this is entirely right.** Again speaking generally (sometimes the circumstances of war provide exceptions to the rule), the members of the species that survive do not do so by chance; it is because they are genetically better fitted to survive, and therefore it is their genes, and not those of the non-survivors, that it is most desirable to pass on to succeeding generations. **This is real progress.**

But it is not only genetically that Man develops; he develops culturally and morally as well. Beneficial characteristics have been developed, such as altruism and the rejection of incest as part of a legitimate furtherance of our race. These characteristics have proved their beneficial effect upon our society by adding to the total cultural-genetic survival value of our civilisation.

The real point of morality and culture in a civilisation, however, is that they do not make their impact upon isolated individuals — as would, for instance, a genetic mutation which would then, through those individuals, either die out (in the case of a bad mutation) or spread through the gene pool in the case of a good one — they make their impact upon **all** individuals in a given society.

No matter how genetically superior an individual race or nation may be, if its ethics have been eroded, sabotaged or in any other way changed for the worse, that nation is in danger of being superseded by competing races or nations, even including some whose genetic inheritance is of inferior quality. And throughout history that is precisely what has happened in such instances of moral deterioration; it is man's experience of this process that has led societies to impose rigid moral restraints upon the individuals therein in order to sustain the survival capacity of the group.

THE TWENTIETH CENTURY: A BREAK WITH THE PAST

Although evolution works slowly, even imperceptably in our eyes, it is nonetheless operating all the time. However, in previous times it was enough to let nature work its own way in weeding out society's genetic misfits and weaker elements. Such a practice is now no longer possible without our incurring severe genetic regression. Evolution, which previously ensured our advancement, has now come to a halt, and is in fact going into reverse. We are now actually evolving **backwards**.

What is unique about the 20th century is that whoever (or whatever) is born usually survives — survives to maturity and so can pass on its genes. This situation is totally unparalleled in the history of life on this planet, which is reckoned at between 3 and 4 billion years. What we have done, through technology, through the welfare state, through advanced medicine and through liberal morality, is prevent the death of the unfit, the maladapted, the deformed and the grotesque.

Contd. overleaf

Page thirteen

GENETICS AND CULTURE IN A RACIAL NATIONALIST STATE

(Contd. from prev. page)

In the 20th century, not only the best of us survive and create the next generation, but the worst also survive to give their kind to the next generation. Taken alone, this might indicate that, while we are no longer evolving forwards, we are merely marking time, staying much the same. Unfortunately, however, this is not the case. It is a well-known fact that the lower elements within society are today much more prolific on a *per-capita* basis than the rest of the nation. What this means is that **the worst elements of the population are now making up an increasing proportion of that population**. It is this fact which explains why we, as a nation, are now evolving backwards.

Concomitant with this alarming genetic development is the fact that, with the advent of mass communication and the irresponsibility that has come with it, new false ethics have been drawn up — without regard to the benefit of society — and promoted by the organs of mass communication on a massive scale.

And it should go without saying that politics, as they are structured today, are part of the problem. The ethos shared by the main political parties, the parties of the so-called 'establishment', is totally opposed to any recognition of race as a factor in shaping society and civilisation, and is therefore opposed to any proposition aimed at raising the population's race quality. The parties of the 'establishment' all promote a whole range of ideas that are thoroughly destructive to our race and nation: racial equality, sexual equality, abortion on demand, 'free' love, birth-control, and so on. These are just a few of the ideas promoted as part of a morality founded on liberalism.

Indeed the very nature of political 'democracy' makes this process almost inevitable; in previous ages western societies were usually dominated by strong and wise *elites*, conscious of evolutionary needs and therefore of the necessity to maintain firm moral standards in order to enforce racial cohesion and ensure the procreation of future generations in a manner consistent with genetic upbreeding. 'Democracy', by contrast, results in government constantly under pressure to please the mob, to pander to its selfish whims and desires and to satisfy its craving for gratification of the moment. In such a climate, it is inexpedient to talk to the individual about his duties but practical only to capitulate to his demand for more and more 'rights' — including of course the right of the lowest elements in society to breed without limit while the nation pays the bill.

Under democracy, those who have power (or at least its outer trappings) are those who can make themselves the most popular with the greatest numbers of voters. Considering that all the people of 18 or over now have the vote — and the park-bench sleeper and

meths-drinker the same one vote as the leading heart-surgeon — all policy must play down to the lowest common denominator, that is the bottom of the pyramid which is that pyramid's widest part.

The cumulative effect of all this is that our society is increasingly losing direction as a cohesive whole, is becoming disjointed and is slowly being pulled apart.

THE DANGER

While our race, and humanity in general, will not evolve back to the primieval slime overnight, the consequences of ignoring the new situation and rejecting its correct remedy will inevitably be disastrous.

The moral and cultural aspect, though, is possibly even more serious, for while a gradual erosion of our overall genetic level can be reversed, should our cultural atmosphere continue to degenerate we could find ourselves defeated by an enemy, either of the normal external kind that has menaced us over the ages or of an internal nature created by an alliance of race-mixing liberals and aliens capturing the reins of political power. Either event could mar our racial integrity and spell the end of our race and nation.

To take an example of ethics that are forcing cultural decay, if self-interest and personal greed are promulgated as desirable individual traits, as they undoubtedly have been during the era of Mrs. Thatcher's 'free market' society, and this tendency is continued for, say, another 20 years, the whole moral climate in Britain will change to reflect such values. Altruism — the spirit of concern for something higher than oneself, such as race or nation — will wither away completely, and press stories like the one headed 'Bus queue ignore rape victim' will become so commonplace as no longer to be called news. Likewise, elements in society renowned for self-sacrifice, such as nurses, lifeboatmen, etc., will become fewer and essential services will come under further strain — to the point of either collapsing or requiring a massive increase in taxes for them to be maintained. In a thousand different ways, if altruism is lost, social cohesion will fall apart and the nation will be doomed to die.

One example of cultural decay giving rise to genetic decay is the growth in propaganda for race-mixing — this being assisted everywhere by the film industry, TV, the visual arts, the theatre, press and publishing. The inevitable result of this combined cultural onslaught on the principle of racial integrity will be that more and more people will feel free to indulge in miscegenation, without thought for the long-term genetic consequences of their actions. Miscegenation is in fact the product of cultural decay, whereby there is a lack of moral restraint allied to a lack of good cultural norms that forbid such miscegenation. Under such conditions it is no wonder that miscegenation becomes commonplace.


Another recurring 'moral' posture of 20th century culture is that

Contd. on page 20

HUMAN GARBAGE ON THE MARCH

This is happening literally (as in this picture) and figuratively in many more ways. Here a column of hippies is being escorted by police away from Stonehenge. Due to the benevolence of our welfare state, this idle, feckless and parasitic segment of the population is enabled to thrive and breed (notice the kids) while the useful and productive are denying themselves in order to keep them in security and comfort





SIR: I thought the readers of *Spearhead* might appreciate the following cameo.

During a lunch break I was talking to an Asian girl who works in my department. She was telling me of her elder sister, who has been 'sold' to a wealthy man living in the Indian sub-continent for about £20,000.

"She is so lucky," explained my interlocutor, "her horoscope is terrible, a grotty planet in the third house, and her husband-to-be knows this — that sort of thing can make or break a girl's chances in our community."

So why, I asked, was her sister able to make such a favourable marriage?

"Because she is particularly light-skinned. If you are fair-skinned, you are sought after for that reason alone. It has always been that way. With her rotten astrologer's reading, had my sister had dark skin, no man would have wanted her — at least no man worth having."

Do not these innocent remarks just about say it all? The more sign of the remains of Caucasoid blood in an Asian girl the higher she is thought of in her own community. How ironic that the average White does not seem to give a damn about preserving his precious blood heritage. And what an unintentional compliment the Asian attitude pays the White Man!

MARTIN M. DWYER
Newton Abbot, Devon

SIR: In *The Times* for the 13th January I came across the following on page 12 in the 'Times Diary':-

"But togetherness will rule at Labour's Burns Night party at Battersea Town Hall on January 24th. Black MP Paul Boateng threatens to celebrate his Scottish ancestry by donning a kilt plus full regalia."

Some joke, surely?

G.R. KEMP
Gosport, Hants.

SIR: Portugal's decision to grant rights to its 100,000 citizens in Macao to live and work in the EEC is one of the best examples yet of the hidden dangers inherent in our membership of that pernicious body.

For those whose knowledge of the geography of China may be limited, Macao is the Portugese colony next door to our own

Hong Kong. The green light must now be flashing for the 3 million holders of British passports in Hong Kong, telling them that they too are entitled to the same treatment.

When the day arrives in 1997 for handing Hong Kong back to the Chinese, the 3 million will find themselves trapped between life under communism or flight to the West. Before then, of course, there will be the inevitable appeal to the European Court of Human Rights, which, given the Portugese precedent, will undoubtedly be upheld. Then the great flood into this country will begin.

Thank you, 'Partner'!

P. HAWES
Sevenoaks, Kent

SIR: If Mrs. Thatcher could be sure of leading the first Conservative victory in the United States of Europe, her opposition to the further integration of Britain into the EEC (after 1992) would cease overnight.

A.S. PAULIN
Romford, Essex

SIR: Is there a deliberate government policy to sacrifice our nation's future to appease the ethnic minorities?

I feel this is no longer a democratic country. I am not supposed to tell my children that they should not marry outside their own people — because this is 'racist'. Nevertheless, I have done this and will continue doing so. I also tell them of their own British history, heritage and culture. Why did so many of our countrymen sacrifice their lives in two world wars? Surely, to keep Britain for its own people and for no-one else. So why does our Government try to brainwash us to mix and interbreed with the ethnic minorities? You do not mix dog pedigrees, because if you did you would lose the characteristics and blood lines of the breeds. Why do this to the most important animal of all: the human?

This Government and the Opposition are trying to intimidate our next generation by

Big Brother tactics. My own children and others have told me that they are being forced left-wing ideas by their schoolteachers. They feel frightened to speak up and say what they think at school because of the fear of being reported to the authorities — frightened of being victimised because their thinking is not in line with Big Brother teaching.

What foreign enemies throughout history could not do the ethnic minorities are now doing: invading us — and with our Government's blessing. **Please do what you can to stop this!**

I am not yet a member of any of our nationalist parties, like the British National Party or National Front, but the way that my children and I am being treated in our own country makes my blood boil. I am convinced we need a referendum to stop any further immigration. I would hate to see civil war in this country, but the way racial tension is growing it could come to that.

G. SMITH
Hillingdon, Middlesex

SIR: Your article in January's *Spearhead* concerning the Scottish National Party was totally accurate. The SNP's policies are tailored to suit current trends in left-wing opinion rather than the result of any kind of firm political ideology. An example of this is the party's attitude to membership of the EEC.

In the 1970s, the SNP campaigned against EEC membership, but now its slogan is 'Independence in Europe', which to most rational people is a contradiction in terms. Despite what the news media say, the SNP is not a nationalist party by any honest definition of the term.

I hope that *Spearhead* will continue to expose squalid 'nationalist' frauds of the kind typified by the SNP.

A.A.H. TAIT
Carlisle, Lanarks.

How to obtain SPEARHEAD

Spearhead is available from our office to those who wish to ensure to obtain copies for themselves every month and to those who wish to obtain quantities for redistribution. Those wishing for copies for themselves each month are recommended to take out a subscription by filling in the form below and sending it to us with a cheque or postal order for the applicable sum.

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

The following rates are for 12 issues (please tick in box where applicable):-

British Isles: £8.12 ☐ Overseas unsealed surface mail: £9.74 ☐ Overseas sealed surface mail: £11.09 ☐ Unsealed air mail Middle East: £12.64 ☐ Unsealed air mail Canada, USA, Latin America. Africa: £13.52 ☐ Unsealed air mail Australia, New Zealand, Far East: £15.02 ☐

Please note: These overseas rates apply if remittance is in Pounds Sterling; if remittance is in overseas currency, an additional charge of £5.50 is required in the case of cheques and money orders and £2 in the case of banknotes, these going to pay banker's commission and charges.

Discounts for bulk-purchases can be obtained as follows:-

10-19 copies: 40p each; 20-49 copies: 36p each; 50-99 copies: 30p each; 100-199 copies: 26p each; 200-499 copies: 22p each; 500 copies or over: 20p each. (For advice on postal rates, please contact our office).

All cheques and postal orders should be made out to *Spearhead* and sent to: PO Box 446, London SE23 2LS. Please do not include a payment for *Spearhead* as part of a cheque including payment for any other item.

BOOKS! BOOKS! BOOKS!

BNP Book Service
PO Box 446
London SE23 2LS

THE ELEVENTH HOUR (John Tyndall) £15 hardback; £10 paperback. Mostly written by the BNP leader in prison, this is the book all nationalists have been waiting for. The most comprehensive presentation yet to appear of the case for British Nationalism. 1988, 609pp.

THE NEW UNHAPPY LORDS (A.K. Chesterton) £3.00. An exposure of the financial power that seeks to drag on making into a global police state. 1972, 255pp.

THE ZIONIST FACTOR* (Ivor Benson) £6.50. A study of the Jewish presence in 20th century history. 1986, 216pp.

THE BIOLOGY OF THE RACE PROBLEM (Prof. W.C. George) £1.00. The race equality hoax destroyed by an academic expert. 70pp.

DID SIX MILLION REALLY DIE? (Richard Harwood) 50p. The fact-filled pamphlet that refutes the holocaust legends and has evoked Zionist frenzy. 28pp.

THE HOAX OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY (Prof. A.R. Butz) £2.40. A scientist applies clinical methods to an investigation of the 'holocaust' and completely dissects the myth. 2nd edition 1977, 315pp.

THE MONEY BOMB (James Gibb Stewart) £4.25. Discusses the failure of our debt-based financial system and describes its role in creating inflation. 1983, 158pp.

THE USES OF RELIGION (Prof. Revilo P. Oliver) £1.00. Examines the value of religion as a socially cohesive force. 1982, 36pp.

RACE AND POLITICS (H.B. Isherwood) 30p. Shows that a sense of racial identity is an essential element of nationhood. 1974, 36pp.

RELIGION AND THE RACIAL CONTROVERSY (H.B. Isherwood) 30p. Shows that racial integration is not ordained by Christianity but that the reverse is true. 1970, 16pp.

THE LEMMING FOLK (James Gibb Stewart) £7.95. A witty and factual examination of current attitudes and intellectual fashion that are threatening our future. 1980, 246pp.

THE GRAND DESIGN (Douglas Reed) £2.00. A behind-the-scenes look at modern world history. 1977, 45pp.

THE DISPOSSESSED MAJORITY (Wilmot Robertson) £7.50. This book has attracted worldwide attention, dealing as it does with racial problems in America — and not just simply the black-white situation. 2nd edition 1981, 613pp.

RACE AND REASON (Carlton Putnam) £4.00. A plain, unemotional account of the race issue that has been an invaluable contribution to the debate ever since it was first published. 1961 (rep. 1977), 125pp.

RACE AND REALITY (Carlton Putnam) £4.00. A companion volume and supplement to *Race and Reason*, showing how the truth about the race issue has been suppressed by interested parties. 1967 (rep. 1977), 192pp.

VENTILATIONS (Wilmot Robertson) £4.50. The sequel to the same author's widely acclaimed *The Dispossessed Majority*. Revised edition 1982, 113pp.

THE GLOBAL MANIPULATORS (Robert Eringer) £2.50. While the author repudiates any conspiratorial view of world events, he still provides a comprehensive exposure of the organisation and influence of the Bilderberg Group and the Trilateral Commission. 1980, 95pp.

PEACE STUDIES IN OUR SCHOOLS: PROPAGANDA FOR DEFENCELESSNESS (John Marks) £2.95. An important book on a major current educational scandal: the indoctrination of schoolchildren by pacifist and unilateralist 'educationalists'. This topical and factual study makes it plain that we are not simply confronted with odd teachers here and there abusing their positions but with a whole network of organisations and institutions, some publicly funded, co-ordinating their attack on young people's minds. 1984, 63pp.

THE ZIONIST CONNECTION (Alfred M. Lilienthal) £13.00. The second edition of a sensational exposure by a non-Zionist Jew of Zionist power politics. 1982, 904pp.

TREASON AT WESTMINSTER (Dr. Kitty Little) 50p. Text of a memorandum to the Royal Commission on Criminal Procedure entitled: *Infiltration of the government by members of subversive or criminal organisations for the purpose of furthering the interests of those organisations*. 1979, 24pp.

A WORLD COUP D'ETAT IS PLANNED (Dr. Kitty Little) 50p. Updates the above, giving details of the destructive effects of treaties foisted on Britain. 1984, 66pp.

Here is the latest list of our books. The prices given in each case do not include postal charges, which should be estimated by calculating one eighth the total value of the order. Money should be enclosed with all orders, and all cheques or postal orders should be made out to the BNP Book Service only and not included in remittances sent for other items. Orders are likely to be dealt with more quickly if BNP Book Service is marked on the envelope. New titles are indicated by asterisks.

THE COLLAPSE OF BRITISH POWER (Correlli Barnett) £8.95. A welcome reissue of a vitally important book first published in 1972. Shows how liberalism and lack of political realism brought about Britain's 20th century decline in the political, industrial and military fields. 643pp.

THE ZUNDEL TRIAL AND FREE SPEECH (Doug Christie) £2.25. The defence counsel's address to the jury in the infamous trial in Canada of Ernst Zundel for daring to question the holocaust myth. A ringing defence of free enquiry and free speech. 1985, 32pp.

F.D.R. — THE OTHER SIDE OF THE COIN (Hamilton Fish) £5.00. An exposure of President Roosevelt's war guilt and trickery by a former associate. 1976, 255pp.

STATE SECRETS (Count Leon de Poncins) £3.50. A study of some little-known state documents that throw much light on recent history. 1975, 191pp.

CENSORED HISTORY (Eric Butler) £1.50. An examination of some of the facts of recent history that have not found their way into textbooks or newspapers. 1974, 48pp.

THE CONTROVERSY OF ZION (Douglas Reed) £9.00. A best-seller in nationalist circles ever since its publication. A study of Jewish-Gentile relations since biblical times, packed with little-known and long-suppressed facts. 1979, 580pp.

THE NAMELESS WAR (Capt. A.H.M. Ramsay) £3.25. An outline of the secret history of the events leading up to the Second World War, including information on previous upheavals. The author had the honour of being imprisoned without trial for four years during World War II, despite his status as a member of parliament. Originally published 1952, 128pp.

THE SIX MILLION RECONSIDERED (W. Grimstad) £2.50. Examines not only the 'holocaust' but other topics involved in the Jewish Question, including the exploitation of the 'anti-semitic' smear. 1977, 170pp.

NUREMBERG AND OTHER WAR CRIMES TRIALS: A NEW LOOK (Richard Harwood) 75p. A scholarly exposure of these cynical travesties of justice. 1978, 68pp.

RACIAL KINSHIP (H.B. Isherwood) 30p. A further well argued presentation of the case for 'racism' by the author of *Race and Politics*. 1974, 36pp.

CONSPIRACY OR DEGENERACY? (Prof. Revilo P. Oliver) £4.00. Text of a lecture by the author, a brilliant classical scholar, to New England rally for God, Family and Country in 1966. 76pp.

AMERICA'S DECLINE: THE EDUCATION OF A CONSERVATIVE (Prof. Revilo P. Oliver) £3.50. A collection of articles and reviews on various aspects of the collapse of modern civilisation. 1981, 375pp.

RED PATTERN OF WORLD CONQUEST* (Eric Butler) £3.75. A distinguished Australian patriot shows that the advance of communism has been assisted by the weakness and treachery of western leaders. New ed. 1985, 115pp.

BEHIND THE SCENE* (Douglas Reed) £3.50. A reprint of the second part of the author's *Far and Wide*, published in 1953. The new themes are titled 'Zionism Paramount' and 'Communism Penetrant'. 93pp.

THOUGHT CRIMES: THE KEEGSTRA CASE* (Doug Christie) £2.40. The text of Doug Christie's courtroom defence of the persecuted Canadian school-teacher Jim Keegstra. 1986, 34pp.

THEY DARE TO SPEAK OUT* (Paul Findley) £12.95. The author was an Illinois Congressman for 20 years until he fell foul of the Israeli lobby. This book describes the stranglehold of Zionist power over American politicians, academics and media. Even those familiar with the subject will find this book a revelation. 1985, 362pp.

POPULISM AND ELITISM (Prof. Revilo P. Oliver) £4.00. A study of the purpose and function of political power and the elements which wield it in the present century. 1982, 101pp.

THE ENEMY OF EUROPE (Francis Parker Yockey & Prof. Revilo P. Oliver) £6.00. Thought-provoking essay on the powers set on destroying the European peoples, written by Yockey and accompanied by a review of Yockey's work by Prof. Oliver. 1981, 240pp.

I.Q. AND RACIAL DIFFERENCES (Prof. Henry Garrett) £1.00. Clear and concise summary of the evidence of racial differences in intelligence and their significance in education. 1980, 57pp.

THE UNHOLY ALLIANCE (Patrick Walsh) £2.25. A former Canadian undercover police officer exposes the dirty tricks employed by Zionists and Communists to misdirect and destroy patriotic groups and to suppress free enquiry. 1986, 34pp.

IS THERE INTELLIGENT LIFE ON EARTH? (Prof. Revilo P. Oliver) £4.00. An entertaining survey of modern fallacies and their charlatan promoters. 1983, 94pp.

THE GREAT HOLOCAUST TRIAL (Michael A. Hoffmann II) £4.00. Extremely comprehensive and well written report on the infamous trial of Ernst Zundel in Canada, also covered in *The Zundel Trial and Free Speech*. 1985, 95pp.

OUT! U.K. IN E.E.C. SPELLS DISASTER (Oliver Smedley) £5.00. The political and economic consequences of Britain's membership of the Common Market. 1986, 79pp.

BOUND TO FAIL (Sundry authors) £2.00. A series of articles by various experts covering every aspect of Britain's disastrous membership of the EEC. 1987, 62pp.

TRUTH OUT OF AFRICA (Ivor Benson) £3.25. Developments in Africa, particularly 'Zimbabwe', since 1960, set against a background of the forces at work in the world as a whole. 2nd ed. 1984, 112pp.

TRADITIONALISTS' ANTHOLOGY (Compiled by Elizabeth Lady Freeman) £9.00. A fascinating collection of quotations from a wide variety of writers, many of which are of direct relevance to the nationalist cause. 1986, 185pp.

CHURCHILL'S WAR (David Irving) £16.95. The highly controversial story of Britain's World War II leader during the late pre-war and wartime years. This book was shunned by all the 'establishment' publishers on account of its startling disclosures. Churchill-worshippers and believers in the 'orthodox' version of modern history will not like this book, as it describes its central character as the man who ruined Britain and the British Empire in his insane vendetta against Hitler. 1987, 591pp.

GAY LESSONS (Rachel Tingle) £2.50. A topical exposure of the manner in which homosexuality is encouraged among young people by official bodies at public expense. 1986, 48pp.

THE MURDER OF BRITISH INDUSTRY (John Boyd) 75p. An exposure of the catastrophic economic and industrial effects of Britain's membership of the EEC. 1987, 16pp.

THIS AGE OF CONFLICT (Ivor Benson) £2.00. An exposure of the illegitimate power-structures that exist in 'today's world. 1987, 61pp.

THE ELITE (Barbara Cole) £8.75. The exciting story of the Rhodesian Special Air Service and its campaign against terrorism. 1984, 449pp.

THE BARNES TRILOGY (Harry Elmer Barnes) £2.75. A combined volume containing this famous American revisionist's pamphlets: *Court Historians versus Revisionism*; *Blasting the Historical Blackout*; and *Revisionism and Brainwashing*. These first appeared in 1952, 1963 and 1963 respectively, and this combined edition is dated 1979, with 133pp.

IS THE DIARY OF ANNE FRANK GENUINE? (Robert Faurisson) £2.75. Reprinted from *The Journal of Historical Review*, this is a critical commentary on an emotive historical document. 1982, 62pp.

THE ZIONIST TERROR NETWORK. £2.00. A 12-page report on the murderous activities in the United States of the Jewish Defence League, compiled by the staff of the Institute for Historical Review.

RACE (J.R. Baker) £7.60. The author, a professional zoologist for 50 years, provides an objective and scholarly account of what race means and how the concept has affected human thinking. A specialist book, but one of great importance. 1974, 625pp.

OTHER PUBLICITY MATERIAL

FROM B.N.P. HEADQUARTERS
(Orders with cash to: PO Box 446,
London SE23 2LS)

BNP Statement of Policy

An up-to-date *resume* of the main political objectives of the British National Party. 23p post-free.

BNP Election Manifesto 1983

Booklet outlining the policies on which the British National Party fought the 1983 general election. Entitled *Vote for Britain* (23pp). 43p post-free.

BNP leaflets

Fed up with the party politicians? Reprint of a popular old nationalist leaflet brought up to date. Deals with British National Party policies on the main national issues.

Have you been thrown on the scrapheap by foreign imports? This leaflet deals with unemployment and explains in simple terms how millions of British jobs are being destroyed by the international free trade policies of successive governments. A brief and concise argument for economic nationalism.

Violent crime in Britain: the horrifying truth. Deals with muggings, rapes and other violent attacks on defenceless people, giving examples of specific cases. Calls for much tougher treatment of violent criminals.

This is OUR country. Leaflet questioning people on their views on race riots and multi-racialism and telling them that if they answer affirmatively their place is with the British National Party. Features vivid picture of riot area in flames.

If only we were black... Reprint, updated, of a previous BNP leaflet, drawing attention to the special favours and facilities granted to ethnic minority groups by national and local government, and calling on Whites — particularly the young — to fight for their rights.

Can you spot a red teacher? Updated reprint of an old nationalist leaflet aimed especially at school students and giving advice on how to combat left-wing brainwashing in the classroom.

The great Tory con-trick. Leaflet exposing the way the Tories are currently trying to woo the people with patriotic slogans, while their policies underneath are aimed at the destruction of Britain.

What's the difference? Leaflet spotlighting the similarities between the policies of the Westminster parties over major issues, and the fact that only the BNP offers a real alternative.

Unite with your friends or perish! Leaflet appealing to loyalist Ulster people to join forces with their supporters on the mainland. Lists BNP policies for Northern Ireland.

These leaflets cost £6.00 per 1,000 with postage charges of £2.35 for 1,000 and £2.75 for 2,000.

BNP posters

Multi-racial Britain: the experiment that failed. Help us end it! Collage of riot photos.

Oppose the disarmers! Build up our forces! Make Britain strong! Photo of Royal Marine in action with machine gun.

She freezes in winter while Third World gets £1,000 million a year. Put British people before aliens! Photo of old lady by unlit fire.

Support Ulster: smash terrorism. Hang IRA murderers! Drawing of man holding hangman's rope with wife and youngster and flag in background.

Protect British jobs: ban imports! Special unemployment poster with photo of Japanese cars coming off boat.

Protect our women and old folk: stamp out muggers! Drawing of mugging gang.

What's happened to free speech? Up-date of poster first produced in 1986 showing how the state is trying to gag those who oppose the alien invasion of Britain.

Support White South Africa. This slogan in large white letters on blue background.

These posters measure 12.6in x 17.7in. Each contains the BNP name and address and logo in red, white and blue. Prices: 1-9 at 12p each; 10-19 at 10p each; 20-49 at 8p each; 50 or over at 6p each. Postage should be estimated on the basis of each poster weighing 10g.

BNP Stickers

With slogans:-

Fight subversion: smash communism!

Put British people before aliens! (same as poster)

Start repatriation!

Make Britain strong! (same as poster)

Ban imports! (same as poster)

Stamp out muggers! (same as poster)

Hang IRA murderers! (same as poster)

Protect our young from child murderers: bring back the rope!

Scrap the Anglo-Irish Agreement: Keep Ulster British!

Love the White Race: protect its future!

Abortion is child murder: make it illegal!

Protect us from AIDS: Outlaw homosexuality!

Stickers are self-adhesive, measuring 3.5in x 2.5in.

Each contains BNP name and address and logo in red, white and blue. Price: £2 per 100 plus 24p p&p.

BNP badges

British National Party badges with logo in red, white and blue. Price: £1.25 post-free.

BNP key rings

Key rings with attachment bearing BNP logo in red, white and blue. £1.75 post-free.

BNP cloth logo

BNP logo in cloth, also in red, white and blue. Suitable for sewing onto anorak, etc. £1.50 post-free.

BNP Recordings

Rally '87. Three-hour video-recording of BNP London rally, October 31st 1987. Hear and see speeches by Ronald Rickcord, Ian Sloan, Gus McLeod, Dr. Peter Peel, Richard Edmonds, Stanley Clayton-Garnett, David Bruce and John Tyndall.

Price: £18.00 plus 64p p&p.

Rally '82. Sound recording of BNP rally in London, October 16th 1982, the theme of which was 'Unite and fight for Britain's future!'


Side 1: Includes speech by Charles Parker.

Side 2: Speech by John Tyndall.

PLEASE NOTE: The cassette recording 'Voices of Nationalism', issued by BNP Recordings, has been withdrawn from distribution. Plans are being made to reproduce one side of the recording, John Tyndall's talk on 'The coming British Revolution' on a new cassette in due course.

BNP video

RALLY '87



Video-recording of the
British National Party rally
in London, October 31st
1987

Hear:-

RONALD RICKCORD
IAN SLOAN
GUS MCLEOD
Dr. PETER PEEL
RICHARD EDMONDS
STANLEY CLAYTON-GARNETT
DAVID BRUCE
JOHN TYNDALL

BNP Recordings, PO Box 446, London SE23 2LS

Tyndall Speaks I: Two studio talks:-

Side 1: Talk on 'Our Anglo-Saxon heritage' (about the worldwide dispersion of the peoples of British stock).

Side 2: Talk on 'Britain's economic crisis' (recorded in 1981).

Tyndall Speaks II: Two studio talks:-

Side 1: Talk on 'The case for Nationalism' (the inter-nationalist argument demolished).

Side 2: Talk on 'Tragedy of the 20th Century' (analysis of World War II).

Tyndall Speaks III: Two studio talks:-

Side 1: Talk on 'Why we must repatriate'.

Side 2: Talk on 'Foundations of the national community' (Discourse on racial nationalism and its concepts of government and citizenship).

Tyndall Speaks IV: Two studio talks:-

Side 1: Talk on 'The way to full employment'.

Side 2: Talk on 'The racial time-bomb (A thorough demolition of the multi-racialist point of view and a warning of the dire consequences facing Britain if the multi-racial experiment is not ended).

Cassette recordings available at £3.50 plus 24p p&p.

FROM NORWICH BRANCH B.N.P.
(Orders with cash to A9 Johnson
Place, Norwich NR2 2SA)

BNP self-adhesive stickers, beer mats, ball pens & other items

BNP stickers with slogans:-

(1) Hang convicted terrorist murderers; (2) Boycott the boycott: buy South African; (3) Put Britons first: end positive discrimination for aliens; (4) Stop the riots — peace through repatriation; (5) Smash the IRA — Keep Ulster British; (6) Join us now! Make Britain a riot-free zone; (7) Our country — love it or lose it! (8) Every vote counts — Vote British National Party. Stickers are all self-adhesive, with party logo, name and address.

Prices: £3.50 for 250; £6.50 for 500; £12.50 for 1,000.

3-colour round stickers with BNP logo in red, white and blue (self-adhesive):-

Prices: 1.25in diameter £4.25 for 500; 2.5in diameter £6.25 for 500.

Spearhead stickers: 2in-square stickers advertising *Spearhead* magazine: £1.18 per 100 or £5 for roll of 500.

BNP beer mats with large red, white and blue party logo and party name and address in blue on white background. Ideal recruitment aid for leaving in pubs or for nationalist socials. *Samples for £1 or packs: £5/£10/£20 inc. p&p.*

BNP branch fund cards. *Sample card for 26p in stamps. 10 cards for £1.50 inc. p&p.*

BNP notepads with party logo printed in red, white and blue on each sheet. *1 notepad: £1 plus 24p p&p; 4 notepads: £4 plus 85p p&p.*

BNP ball pens (mixed) all stamped with party name: 25 for £5.

BNP pencils (mixed) all stamped with party name: 30 for £5.

FROM LIVERPOOL BRANCH B.N.P.

(Orders with cash to: PO Box 116,
Liverpool LS9 1SH)

More BNP ball pens

Ball pens bearing the slogan: 'British National Party — for race and nation'. *Sample for 13p post-free.*

* * *

Candour

British views letter, founded by A.K. Chesterton to defend national sovereignty against the menace of international finance. *Subscription: £5 per year.* Obtainable from: Forest House, Liss Forest, Hants. GU33 7DD.

Behind the News

Highly informative newsletter, edited by Ivor Benson. Enquiries from UK, Europe or Australasia to: PO Box 29, Sudbury, Suffolk CO10 6EF. North America to: PO Box 130, Flesherton, Ontario N0C 1E0, Canada. South Africa to: PO Box 1564, Krugersdorp 1740. *Behind the News* is a must for your reading table.

The Truth At Last


Hard-hitting paper for American and other white race patriots. *Sample copy for £1.* Write to: PO Box 1211, Marietta, Ga. 30061, U.S.A.

NEW BUILDING FUND: £4,573.12 STILL NEEDED!

Contributions over the last month to the BNP New Building fund amounted to a modest £165. For this we must largely thank Epping Forest Branch, which has donated £100 from the collection at its recent rally.

The new fund, we remind readers, is to raise money for equipping the new premises recently acquired by the BNP, including in particular security fittings.

Evidently, the urgency of raising money for this new fund has not yet got home to all supporters. Let's do better in February! Please mark all donations 'New Building Fund' and post to PO Box 446, London SE23 2LS.



Meetings this month

JOHN TYNDALL, leader of the British National Party, will be speaking at three meetings during February. These are as follows:-

Saturday, February 4th

ROCHDALE
(Lancs)

2 p.m.

Rendezvous for redirection at Rochdale bus station: 1 p.m.

Also speaking:-

IAN SLOAN

Wednesday, February 22nd

CARDIFF

In the evening

For further details contact South Wales BNP, PO Box 214, Cardiff CF3 9YB

Monday, February 27th

WEST HAM
(N.E. London)

8 p.m.

Rendezvous for redirection outside West Ham Underground Station: 7.30 p.m.

Also speaking:-

DAVID BRUCE

All these meetings are organised by the British National Party. Please bring your friends

WHAT WE THINK

(Contd. from page 3)

universal revulsion against the state of Israel, brought on by the picture it has created of a nation characterised by rampant imperialism, aggression, brutality, hypocrisy and arrogance.

Notwithstanding the still immense world-wide ramifications of Jewish Zionist power, there has been in recent years a gradual chipping away at the once impregnable edifice of that power. Nowadays there are a great many nations able to carry influence in world councils who are not consumed by love for Israel, Zionism or Jewry.

This means that weak and flabby governments, like our own and that of the United States, whose habit it is to sway whichever way the current international winds are blowing, cannot afford any longer to assume that those winds will always be Zionist ones; other interests and other pressures have to be taken into account. It would be very surprising if Mrs. Thatcher were not aware of this.

Now that Mr. Arafat, on behalf of the PLO, has thrown down a challenge to Israel to come

with him to the negotiating table, and his gesture — no doubt very cunningly conceived — has made a considerable international impression, the British Foreign Office and the British Government are faced with the need, not any longer just to please one powerful international lobby, but indeed to please more than one.

It is our guess that this is the most likely explanation of Messrs. Mellor's and Waldegrave's recent verbal slaps on the wrist against Israel. They are intended to appease that nation's many enemies. Probably, Mrs. Thatcher will do her best to smooth over the situation by making, in the coming weeks, some ostentatious gesture of repentance and solidarity towards her Jewish friends, maybe even distancing herself somewhat from the remarks of her junior colleagues — for Jewish power is still undoubtedly the most potent power on the world's stage and, given the need to mobilise all its resources, can still be formidable, indeed probably decisive.

But it is not any longer the **only** power to be taken into account. An also formidable power is now mobilising itself against Jewry — explicitly against the Israeli state but, in a more underlying sense, against the whole evil empire of World Zionism. We believe that this latter power is going to grow in the coming years. The fuel for its growth will be, as in the past, the natural human revulsion against the Zionist juggernaut as, increasingly, it exposes itself in the flesh for what it is.

It means that the times ahead of us are going to be interesting times, very interesting times indeed.

BNP raises the flag in the Highlands!

AT LAST, the British National Party has succeeded in setting up an active unit in the Highlands of Scotland. The unit is based in **Inverness**, and has already started to spread the message locally. Good luck to this, the BNP's northernmost outpost!

NATIONALIST RESPONSE: Quarterly publication of South Wales BNP. Single copies 50p incl. p&p. Annual subscription £2.50. Winter 1989 issue now available. Orders to PO Box 214, Cardiff CF3 9YB.

British Nationalist

British Nationalist is a tabloid published in support of the British National Party, normally on a monthly basis. Sample copies will be sent on receipt of 37p (covering p&p). Subscription for 12 issues is £4.42 (British Isles) or £6 (overseas surface mail). Bulk rates are as follows:-

10 copies	£2.00 + 52p post
25 copies	£4.50 + £1.70 post
50 copies	£8.00 + £2.10 post
100 copies	£14.00 + £2.80 post
150 copies	£20.00 + £3.00 post
200 copies	£25.00 + £3.45 post
300 copies	£35.00 + £4.00 post
400 copies	£44.00 + £5.00 post
500 copies	£53.00) Bulk rates
1,000 copies	£103.00) by Roadline

Cheques/postal orders to *British Nationalist*, PO Box 446, London SE23 2LS. Please keep orders and enquiries concerning *British Nationalist* totally separate from other correspondence in order to avoid confusion and delay.

Could there be any greater accolade than this?

The following letter was sent to one of our readers, Mr. Robert Rhodes of Cheltenham after Mr. Rhodes had posted the sender a copy of our magazine:-

Dear Mr. Rhodes...


...I find *Spearhead* offensive and deeply unpleasant in a civilised society. As this newspaper(?) is careful to stay just inside the law there is, I suppose, nothing that can be done about it. However, I would have hoped that all decent minded people would have expressed their opposition to the unpleasant and often insulting sentiments expressed in *Spearhead*.

Yours sincerely
Paddy Ashdown, MP

SPEARHEAD sales league LEADING MONTHLY BUYERS

1st	Lewisham BNP	75 copies each
	Hackney & Tower Hamlets BNP	
3rd	Enfield BNP	65 copies
4th	Tyneside BNP	50 copies each
	Epping Forest BNP	
6th	Leeds BNP	40 copies

SUPERB RALLY AT LOUGHTON



Loughton rally: John Tyndall speaks (above) with David Bruce and Mark Wilson sitting (left and right of picture); David Bruce takes the platform (below)



Photos by Ian Dell

SUPPORT FUND: MORE NEEDED!

This month we are asking our supporters to contribute more than usual to our Support Fund. Recently we were forced to pay for repairs to our typesetting machine which landed us with a bill which (excluding VAT) comes to £144. 27. This hurt! It would be greatly appreciated if readers would help us replenish the funds depleted by payment of this bill.

Please send all contributions to PO Box 446, London SE23 2LS. Please note that receipts are not normally sent for donations of less than £10 unless specifically requested, in which case SAE would be appreciated.

1989 opened with a splendid BNP rally in Loughton (Essex) on January 11th. David Bruce and John Tyndall spoke, with local organiser Mark Wilson in the chair. The audience topped 100. The collection raised £250 and literature sales a similar amount. Congratulations to Epping Forest (formerly Loughton) branch on a really excellent event, which got the new year off to a fine start.

Contact your local party unit!

THE BRITISH NATIONAL PARTY is organised into active units extending over most of the areas of the United Kingdom. Below we give a list of the addresses of the main units:-

NORTH WEST LONDON

BM Box 3958, London WC1N 3XX

EAST LONDON

PO Box 300, Emma Street, Hackney, London E2 7BZ

SOUTH LONDON

PO Box 446, London SE23 2LS

WEST KENT

PO Box 48, Tonbridge TN11 9JF

EAST KENT

73 Shirkoak Park, Woodchurch, Ashford

EPHING FOREST

PO Box 12, Loughton, Essex IG10 3BU

SUFFOLK

2 Albert Road, Framlingham

NORFOLK

9 Johnson Place, Norwich NR2 2SA

SOUTH WALES

PO Box 214, Cardiff CF3 9YB

BIRMINGHAM

PO Box 771, Great Barr, Birmingham B44 9LZ

EAST MIDLANDS

PO Box 148, Leicester LE3 2YD

LIVERPOOL

PO Box 116, Liverpool L69 1SH

MANCHESTER & SALFORD

PO Box 16, Salford M6 5EP

LEEDS & BRADFORD

PO Box BR10, Bramley, Leeds 13

HUDDERSFIELD

PO Box A43, Huddersfield HD1 4NN

WAKEFIELD

PO Box 101, Wakefield WF2 9XY

DONCASTER

PO Box 73, Doncaster DN4 6BS

SHEFFIELD

PO Box 44, Sheffield, S. Yorks. S1 1ES

DARLINGTON

PO Box 61, Darlington, Co. Durham DL3 9RD

TYNE & WEAR

PO Box 8, South Shields NE33 1LP

SCOTLAND

PO Box 85, Glasgow G3 8UL

The BNP also has units in Gloucestershire, Hertfordshire, Bedford, Luton, Cambridge, Brierley Hill (West Midlands), Burton-on-Trent, Nottingham, North Nottinghamshire, Bolton & Bury, Rochdale, Warrington, Hull, Halifax, Dewsbury, Sunderland, Cumbria and Inverness. If you want to make contact with any of these units, or start a new unit, please write to BNP Head Office at PO Box 446, London SE23 2LS.

GENETICS AND CULTURE IN A RACIAL NATIONALIST STATE

(Contd. from page 14)

of pacifism. But a group of conscientious objectors is viable only until the last patriot in the larger society is killed by that society's enemies. What this means for a cultural-genetic group is that this philosophy (pacifism) will destroy the group and pacifism as a cultural value will in any case vanish along with the culture that espoused it!

From this we can see that, although our present genetic decline is serious, that of overall cultural decay, including that giving rise to such things as miscegenation and pacifism, is even more serious.

Genetically speaking, we are facing slow decline (and this is without the current and additional problem of alien population incursions and miscegenation), and the following is now predictable with scientific accuracy if procreation is left to the roulette wheel of the mating game:-

Inferior and deleterious genes will spread throughout the community with the passing of time. The mental and physical qualities of our people will, on the average, decline. Criminal behaviour, insanity, hereditary diseases and deformity will all increase — because the genes carrying those characteristics and behaviour patterns will spread unchecked throughout the gene pool. Average intelligence will also decline, **thus giving despots of the one-worlder type the opportunity to strengthen their control over a mass of increasingly witless people. Independent and creative thinkers, who traditionally have few offspring, will die out.** The long-term effect of all this is that within 200-250 years our civilisation will collapse under the pressure of genetic breakdown, swamped by bad genes and defective mutations — should it not have been conquered by some external foe beforehand. The few individual thinkers, geniuses and genuine wealth-creators will simply not be able to support the unthinking, uncreative, unintelligent and, to a large extent, unhealthy mass.

This appalling fate can only be averted by government recognising procreation as a matter of vital national importance, and taking the initiative to create conditions to ensure that it proceeds in an upwardly evolutionary direction. But before we can consider the measures necessary to this policy we should first look at the question of what qualities have been evolved through natural selection. This is necessary because with new technology we can, should we so choose, literally take control of our own genetic development, our own evolution, and direct it in almost any course we choose. This is what the 20th century means more than anything else.

A DEFINITION OF EVOLUTION

Before a definition of evolution is given, a brief look at the organisation of life itself will be useful, both for now and later when genetics are discussed.

The carbon atom is most important in this regard, linking with

oxygen, hydrogen and nitrogen to form complex molecules which are the whole basis of life on this planet. DNA (or deoxyribonucleic acids) are molecules capable of replicating themselves, and the living cell is more complex still (there can be 10 to the power of 17 atoms in a single living cell, i.e. 1,000,000,000,000,000,000) and is made up of DNA gathered in groups known as genes, and also DNA strung in ribbons known as chromosomes. This discovery was made by Nobel prizewinner Dr. Francis Crick.

Life itself, however, aims at self-perpetuation and not evolution, in other words the replicative invariance of DNA. Evolution is forced **only** by the impact of the changing environment on living matter. Furthermore, most evolutionary changes or mutations are harmful (in a ratio of about 1,000 to 1) and the mutations best able to survive are more fit to live and spread throughout the gene pool. The bad mutations breed out through natural selection, and evolution is a piling up of the beneficial mutations.

Always, evolution has run into a dead end in development of higher life until an evolutionary breakthrough occurs, after which there may be a further period of stagnation before the process repeats itself. Evolution is not gradual but occurs in sharp spurts.

Evolution, which is the process of natural selection, has been defined by H. Chandler Elliott in his book *The Shape of Intelligence* as that process which produces in life a greater degree of intelligence. This seems reasonable, although I would qualify it by saying 'animal intelligence'. Clearly, evolving artificial intelligence, such as developing bigger and faster computers, is **not** what we are talking about. Intelligence is defined as: (a) the ability to cope with the environment, and (b) the capacity to experience pleasure and pain.

If then natural selection is no longer working upon North European Man in the 20th century, if we are no longer evolving forward and upward by the workings of nature, the only alternative to genetic decay and destruction of our race is for us consciously to **control** our own evolution. We do at least have some guide to show us in what direction we should exercise that control.

Much work has already been done to help us. Raymond B. Cattell, in his book *Beyondism — a New Morality from Science*, describes further criteria of evolutionary progress. Cattell, an American psychologist of world repute, claims that to survive and evolve higher is **the** most important aim and function of any cultural-genetic community. Cattell, however, while brilliant in his field, seems just as politically ignorant and prejudiced as the rest of the conventionally 'liberal' intellectual community. He fails completely to perceive that current political orthodoxy will not embrace his genetically supremacist ideas, and he actually attacks the one political concept that indeed might do so: that of racial nationalism! Incredibly, elsewhere he embraces political democracy, with its implicit acceptance of 'equality', and he largely ignores genetic engineering, which, at the very least, ought to be discussed. These points aside, Cattell's *Beyondism* can be seen to correspond closely with racial nationalist aspirations, and it is a truly monumental work.

TO BE CONTINUED NEXT MONTH

Find out about the British National Party

Send 30p for information pack

To:
P.O. BOX 446
LONDON SE23 2LS

Name.....

Address.....

I enclose.....